בס"ד

FULL ELUCIDATED EDITION · PARKLAND

תשרי ה'תשכ"ג

ד' מאמרים · תשרי ה'תשכ"ג · יצאו לאור בקונטרסי תנש"א

Tishrei 5723

CONTENTS

יבחר לנו את נחלתינו (Rosh Hashanah) · וכל אדם (Shabbos Shuvah) · בסוכות תשבו (Sukkos) · תורה צוה (Simchas Torah)

OCCASION

Tishrei 5723 — four maamarim released together across the 5751 Tishrei kuntreisim

EDITORIAL STATUS

Two מוגה by explicit in-source note, two מוגה by cataloguer labeling — see Method

> *One argument carried across a month: a coronation no angel can witness, an atonement that repairs nothing because nothing there was ever broken, a sukkah built from light that cannot settle, and a heritage danced rather than said. Four maamarim, one essence of the soul, traced from Rosh Hashanah to Simchas Torah.*

The complete bilingual study edition of all four maamarim in sequence, with a shared method, a map tracing how each maamar hands its terms to the next, and one combined source-note apparatus.

OPENCHASSIDUS

About this edition

This volume collects, in sequence, the four maamarim of the Rebbe released together across the Tishrei 5751 kuntreisim: יבחר לנו את נחלתינו (second day of Rosh Hashanah), וכל אדם (Shabbos Shuvah), בסוכות תשבו (second day of Sukkos), and תורה צוה (Simchas Torah) — all said in 5723. Each was built and shipped as its own standalone edition first; this volume reprints all four with a single front matter, one combined Method/Verification section, a map tracing how the four maamarim hand their central terms to one another, and one merged source-note apparatus. Nothing about the four maamarim's own bilingual bodies — translation, deep dives, avodah and summary boxes — has been altered from the standalone editions; they are reproduced here exactly, in sequence.

Method — shared across all four

Hebrew right, English left throughout. Bold marks the maamar's own words, translated in full — every Hebrew clause has a facing bold translation, checked with a ratio tool comparing Hebrew and English character counts per block. Lighter italic carries the elucidation, woven in at the point of use rather than deferred to endnotes. Every printed footnote from all four maamarim is carried into the merged Source Notes with a citation status: `VERIFIED` for a citation independently confirmed (chiefly cross-references between the four maamarim themselves, since building all four in one project made those checkable in a way an isolated edition's footnotes are not), and `AS CITED` for a citation reproduced exactly as the source printing gives it, without independent retrieval of the target text.

Four maamarim, two source types

The four editions were not built from a uniform source. יבחר לנו and וכל אדם were built from the published, reflowed text at he.chabad.org (ועד הנחות בלשון הקודש) — the second of these had to be fetched through a live browser render, since the site is Cloudflare-gated against plain HTTP fetches. בסוכות תשבו and תורה צוה were built from page-image scans of the printed Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 5 — pure image PDFs with no embedded text layer, transcribed by direct visual reading. The two scanned sources needed real correction passes: a first fast transcription of בסוכות תשבו produced duplicated passages and misattributed footnotes, caught before translation by slowing down and re-reading each flagged region against the scan; the same discipline, applied to תורה צוה from the start, still caught six more errors via an automated repeated-word scan. Both correction histories are preserved in each maamar's own `hebrew-source.md`, referenced again in the per-maamar notes on the Verification pages below.

Editorial status — not uniform, and not assumed

The source page for יבחר לנו states explicitly, in its own header note, that it is מוגה — edited by the Rebbe. בסוכות תשבו and תורה צוה are each the specific file mafteiach.app's own cataloguing labels "מוגה" for that maamar, as against a separately-listed draft edition for each, not used — a cataloguer's labeling, not an in-scan editorial note independently confirmed. The source page for וכל אדם asserts no מוגה status at all, and none is inferred here from the other three. Each maamar's own status is recorded plainly in its section divider below, not harmonized to a single claim for the volume as a whole.

Footnote apparatus — not uniformly verified

The footnote apparatus for the two web-text maamarim follows the same verification discipline as their standalone editions. The footnote apparatus for the two scanned-source maamarim (בסוכות תשבו, תורה צוה) is disclosed at a stricter confidence level, per their own transcription histories: treat every citation locator for those two maamarim as unconfirmed for exact page/volume numbers without an independent human read against the original scans (`full-source-scan.pdf`, preserved in each maamar's own edition folder).

How the four maamarim connect

One argument, four occasions. This page traces the terms each maamar hands to the next — not a summary of all four, but the load-bearing connective tissue a reader moving straight through will actually use.

THE ESSENCE OF THE SOUL	1–4	The term that never leaves. יבחר לנו establishes it as the level "with whom did He take counsel" reaches — the soul's root in essential thought, prior to creation, where "the Essence thinks about an other." וכל אדם uses that same essence-bond to explain why the Kohen Gadol's atonement-service (not the room itself) excludes every angel. בסוכות תשבו reads the sukkah's own "far encompassing light" as this identical essence, now settled through sitting rather than atoning. תורה צוה closes on it as the level at which "all Israel are equal" — Yaakov's own name — where the heir simply stands in the testator's place.
REVEALED WILL, ABSOLUTE WILL, OWNER OF THE WILL	1–2	יבחר לנו builds the three-tier map of the shofar: the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; teshuvah draws the absolute will's own bearing on the revealed will; the essence-bittul draws the absolute will itself. וכל אדם imports this map wholesale to explain teshuvah's own two levels — atonement through the "Owner of the will, not compelled by the will" (still in relation to the will) versus the essence-of-the-day's atonement (never in that relation at all, so never breached to begin with).
EIGHTH, ABOVE THE CHAIN OF WORLDS	1–2	יבחר לנו does not use this term; וכל אדם introduces it fresh — an eighth-after-seven still relates causally to its own seven (circumcision, the Kohen Gadol's entry after seven days); an eighth-before-seven (the sprinkling that opens the Yom Kippur service) does not, and neither does anything in the created order have standing before it. The same distinction resurfaces, restated as "encompassing light relative to itself vs. relative to the Essence," in בסוכות תשבו §4.
ATONEMENT THAT REPAIRS VS. ATONEMENT THAT REVEALS	2–3	The hardest move in וכל אדם: teshuvah repairs a real, if only external, breach; the essence of the day's own atonement reveals a bond that was never breached at all, because it was never in the kind of relation where breach applies. בסוכות תשבו builds directly on this in §5, distinguishing the two exact same registers by name and mapping the sukkah's own transformation onto the second, deeper one.
MIKIFF KAROV / MIKIFF RACHOK — NEAR AND FAR ENCOMPASSING LIGHT	3 only, prepared by 1–2	New vocabulary in בסוכות תשבו, but not new content: the near/far split is the same eighth-after/eighth-before distinction from וכל אדם §2, and the same revealed-will/absolute-will distinction from יבחר לנו §8, now applied to a physical mitzvah (sitting in a sukkah) rather than an act of atonement or a sounding.
INHERITANCE, GIFT, CHOICE	1, 4	The opening verse of יבחר לנו itself — "He shall choose our heritage for us" — pairs choice and inheritance from the very first line of the set. תורה צוה returns to that exact verse in its own §7 to resolve its hardest distinction: choice (and gift) still require a chooser and a chosen, a giver and a recipient — but the deepest inheritance needs no such structure, because the heir simply stands in the testator's place. The set's opening pairing and its closing payoff are the same two words.
BINDINGS ACROSS THE WHOLE RUN	all four	וכל אדם §9 names the occasion of תורה צוה directly — the Zohar's Yosef-and-his-brothers reading, "no one stood with him," attached explicitly to Shemini Atzeres, the series' final stop. בסוכות תשבו §6 imports the shofar's three-tier map from יבחר לנו by name to explain the Ten Days' own "out of the depths." תורה צוה §5 cites the coronation language of יבחר לנו itself ("that you make Me King over you") to explain why Yeshurun — "a song with no beginning or end" — is the name for Rosh Hashanah's own essence-revelation. Every maamar after the first names at least one of its predecessors explicitly, not only thematically.

יבחר לנו את נחלתינו
את גאון יעקב

ד"ה יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב · יום ב' דראש-השנה ה'תשכ"ג · מוגה

Let Him Choose Our Heritage for Us

> *A verse said seven times immediately before the shofar is sounded — and about what the person holding the shofar is actually doing.*

The argument at a glance

Eleven moves, one question: the verse says God chooses — from His own side, where nothing we do can reach. So why is it said in the same breath as the verse about our blowing?

QUESTION	א	The Frierdiker Rebbe reads גאון יעקב — via Targum's בית מקדשא דיעקב — as the point of Jewishness resting in the point of the heart of every Jew. The plain sense reads it as the Beis HaMikdash restored. How do the two readings connect?
ADJACENCY	ב	Psalm 47 is said seven times before the tekios because of עלה אלקים בתרועה: our blowing moves Him from the throne of judgment to the throne of mercy. But יבחר לנו is His choice, in Atzmus, where an arousal from below has no purchase *at all*. The adjacency of the two verses says both are drawn by the shofar.
THE PARADOX	ג	Rosh Hashanah is the building of malchus; the withdrawal is total, so the rebuild must come from Atzmus — so the shofar touches Atzmus. But the shofar is a *mitzvah*, and commands presuppose a King. How does obeying the King's command *make* Him King?
WHY ATZMUS	ד	Malchus is revelation. To reveal in Asiyah — down to the inanimate, וידע כל פעול — you need malchus as a partzuf of its own; hence a physical act, an animal's horn, and a horn detached. And the further down a drawing reaches, the higher its root: the הפלאה of wisdom, which can clothe itself in a parable precisely because it knows the thing itself.
PRECISION	ה	Then "Atzmus" in those derushim means the *הפלאה* of Ohr Ein Sof — not Atzmus itself. Only the reason of section ג — that the withdrawal is at every level — requires עצמות אוא"ס ממש. Two reasons, two addresses, one phrase.
NESHAMOS	ו	Rosh Hashanah renews man, and through man the world. The building of malchus is chiefly for the souls — souls and malchus are one thing. So the drawing must come from above the souls' own existence. How can a soul's avodah reach above its own existence? **It doesn't have to.** What acts is not its existence but its essence — עצם הנשמה, rooted in Atzmus. FN 46
THOUGHT	ז	ישראל עלו במחשבה — *essential* thought. Ordinary thought sits outside the thinker; this one is one with Him. Hence the consultation במי נמלך was about the very thought of creating. And that structure — the Essence thinking about an other — is the structure of kingship itself: אין מלך בלא עם.
THREE WILLS	ח	The answer to section ג. In אנא אמלוך: revealed will, concealed will, and absolute will. An arousal from below has no intrinsic claim on Him — it works only because the absolute will decided it would, so that His kingship be *from the world's side*. FN 56 So the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; the essence-bittul draws the absolute will that licensed the arousal.
THREE IN SHOFAR	ט	The absolute will has two faces: as it bears on the revealed will (its הפלאה), and itself (its free choice). Map: the *mitzvah* of shofar arouses the revealed will; *teshuvah* draws the הפלאה; the revealed *essence of the soul* draws the choice itself.
WHY IT COLLAPSES	יו"ד	The inner reason everything returns each year: the rebuild is routed through אמרו לפני מלכיות, so something of the absolute will reaches the world too — and the world is thereby completed as a dwelling. The annual dismantling is not damage. It is the design. FN 60
ANSWER	יא	So the request before the tekios: that the shofar reveal the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus — rooted there because He freely chose, יבחר לנו. Revealed in the point of the heart, נחלתינו; and since that revelation reaches the

world, the two readings meet in the Third Beis HaMikdash. Mercies drawn by an arousal are bounded by it; these are drawn by His choice, and so are without bound.

Whose Mikdash, and why called Yaakov's

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ג

Psalm 47 verse 5 asks that God "choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov whom He loved." The Rebbe opens not with the verse but with his father-in-law's maamar on the same verse in *Hemshech Rosh Hashanah* 5703, which begins from Targum's rendering: *the Sanctuary of Yaakov, whom He loved forever*. Two exactitudes follow. The Mikdash is God's — "make **for Me** a Sanctuary"; Israel only build it. So why is it called *Yaakov's*? And what has "the pride of Yaakov," which the Frierdiker Rebbe takes to mean the Mikdash, to do with "our heritage"? The answer given there relocates the Sanctuary: it is the point of Jewishness resting in the point of the heart — "I will dwell **among them**," not *in it*. Which leaves the Rebbe with the question that will occupy all eleven sections: how does that reading connect to the plain one, where the verse is a request for the Temple to be rebuilt?

"Let Him choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov whom He loved, selah."[1] *The verse is the fifth of Psalm 47, the psalm said seven times before the shofar is sounded.* **And my father-in-law the Rebbe, in his maamar on this same verse**[2] *— the Frierdiker Rebbe's ד"ה יבחר לנו in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703 —* **brings the Targum's rendering: *"may He take pleasure in us, to give us as our inheritance the Sanctuary of Yaakov, whom He loved forever,"* and is exacting about it.** *Targum turns "the pride of Yaakov" into the Beis HaMikdash and "our heritage" into what we are given to inherit. Both moves need justifying.*

עמ' ג · ריש המאמר

יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב אשר אהב סלה[1], ומביא כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר במאמרו ד"ה זה (שבהמשך ר"ה תש"ג)[2] פירוש התרגום, ירעי לנא למירת ית אחסנתנא ית בית מקדשא דיעקב דרחים לעלמין, ומדייק בזה,

For the Beis HaMikdash is the Holy One's, as it is written[3] **"and they shall make *for Me* a Sanctuary" — [Israel merely *make* the Sanctuary; the Sanctuary itself is the Holy One's] — so why is it called the Sanctuary *of Yaakov*?** *The bracket is the Rebbe's own, sharpening the point: Israel's role in the verse in Terumah is constructional, not proprietary.* **And further: what is the connection of "the pride of Yaakov," which refers to the Beis HaMikdash, to "our heritage"?** *An inheritance is something that was already the heir's by right of descent. A building one was commissioned to erect for someone else is not that.*

עמ' ג

הרי בית המקדש הוא של הקב"ה כמ"ש[3] ועשו **לי** מקדש [דישראל הם רק עושים את המקדש, אבל המקדש עצמו הוא של הקב"ה] ולמה נקרא בית מקדשא **דיעקב**. גם, מהי השייכות דגאון יעקב שקאי על בית המקדש לנחלתינו.

And it is explained in the maamar[4] **that "our heritage" is the point of Jewishness that rests in the point of the heart** *— the irreducible core of a Jew's bond with God, which is not an achievement and so cannot be lost —* **and *that* is the "Sanctuary of Yaakov," as it is written "make for Me a Sanctuary and I shall dwell *among them*": it does not say *in it* but *among them* — within each and every Jew.**[5] *The classic reading, traced in the apparatus through Reishis Chochmah, the Alshich, the Shelah and Likkutei Torah. Both exactitudes dissolve at once: it is Yaakov's Sanctuary because it is inside Yaakov's children, and it is a heritage because what is inside them was theirs by descent, not by construction.*

עמ' ג

ומבאר בהמאמר[4], דנחלתינו הוא נקודת היהדות השורה בנקודת הלב שהוא הבית מקדשא דיעקב, כמ"ש[3] ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם, בתוכו לא נאמר אלא בתוכם, בתוך כאו"א מישראל[5].

Now, the plain meaning of "let Him choose our heritage for us… the pride of Yaakov" is that in the time to come He will return to us our Beis HaMikdash.[6] *So the commentators on the psalm. This is not a competing reading to be defeated; it is the reading a Jew saying the psalm before the shofar actually has in mind.* **And it needs to be understood: what is the connection between the interpretation given in the maamar — that "the pride of Yaakov" refers to the Beis HaMikdash within every Jew — and the plain interpretation, that "the pride of Yaakov" refers to the Third Beis HaMikdash, which will be built speedily in our days?** *This is the question the discourse is built to answer, and it is answered in section יא — nine sections later, by way of the shofar, the three wills, and the annual collapse of malchus. Everything between here and there is the road.*

עמ' ג · סוף ס"א

והנה הפירוש הפשוט דיבחר לנו גו' את גאון יעקב הוא, שלעתיד לבוא יחזיר לנו את בית מקדשינו[6]. וצריך להבין הקשר דהפירוש (שבהמאמר) שגאון יעקב קאי על בית המקדש שבכאו"א מישראל עם הפירוש (הפשוט) שגאון יעקב קאי על בית המקדש השלישי שיבנה במהרה בימינו.

DEEP DIVE

"The point of the heart" — why the Sanctuary had to be relocated inward

The move from the Sanctuary in Jerusalem to the sanctuary in the chest is one of the oldest in the sources cited here, and it is not a softening. It has a hard consequence which this maamar will exploit: a Sanctuary made of stone can be destroyed and its service suspended, and the verse's request would then be a request for restoration *from outside*. A Sanctuary that is the point of Jewishness in the heart cannot be destroyed at all — only covered. So the verse's request becomes a request for *revelation*, not construction. Hold that shift: in section יא the Rebbe will show that these are not two requests but one, because what is revealed inside is precisely what completes the world outside, and the completion has an address — the Third Beis HaMikdash.

IN AVODAH

The first thing the maamar does is refuse to let "what we build" and "what is ours" be the same category. Almost everything a person can point to on Rosh Hashanah — the resolutions, the prayer, the year's accounting — is in the first category. The verse asks about the second. Before the shofar, the honest question is not *what have I made of myself* but *what is in me that I did not make*.

SUMMARY

The verse's two words are both puzzling: the Mikdash is God's, yet Targum calls it Yaakov's; and a Sanctuary one is commissioned to build is not an inheritance. The Frierdiker Rebbe resolves both by locating the Sanctuary in the point of the heart of every Jew. That leaves the Rebbe's question: how does the inward Sanctuary connect to the plain sense — the Temple rebuilt?

Why this psalm before the shofar — and the problem in the adjacency

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ג–ד

The psalm containing our verse is said seven times immediately before the tekios. The obvious reason is its sixth verse: *"God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar."* Vayikra Rabbah reads the two divine names as two thrones — He first sits on the throne of judgment (*Elokim*), and when Israel take up their shofros and blow, He rises from it and sits on the throne of mercy (*Havayah*). So the psalm is said as a proof from Torah for what the shofar is about to accomplish. But then the whole psalm is said, not that one verse — which means every verse in it belongs to the same theme, and our verse is the one immediately before it. And that is a problem, because "He chooses" names something that by definition cannot be aroused from below.

Now, this verse is in the psalm said seven times before the sounding of the shofar, and the connection of this psalm to the shofar, in its plain sense, is that in this psalm[7] it says "God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar"; and our Sages said[8] that at first the Holy One sits (and ascends) upon the throne of judgment — "*Elokim* has ascended with a teruah" — and by Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, He rises from the throne of judgment and sits upon the throne of mercy — "*Havayah* with the sound of a shofar" — and He is filled with mercy for them[9] and has compassion on them, and turns for them the attribute of judgment into mercy. *Note the sequence the footnote is careful about: the "filled with mercy" clause comes in the midrash after the second name is quoted, not before. That ordering matters later — the mercy is a consequence of the shofar, not its precondition.*

עמ' ג · ס"ב

והנה פסוק זה הוא בהמזמור שאומרים ז' פעמים קודם תקיעת שופר, והשייכות דמזמור זה לתקיעת שופר (בפשטות) הוא, כי במזמור זה[7] נאמר עלה אלקים בתרועה הוי' בקול שופר, ואמרו רז"ל[8], שבתחלה הקב"ה יושב (ועולה) על כסא דין, עלה **אלקים** בתרועה, וע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה הוא עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים, **הוי'** בקול שופר, ומתמלא[9] עליהם רחמים ומרחם עליהם והופך עליהם מדת הדין לרחמים.

And therefore this psalm is said before the shofar is sounded, in order to bring a proof from Torah[10] for the drawing-down — that He rises from the throne of judgment and sits on the throne of mercy[11] — that comes about through the sounding of the shofar. *The function assigned to the psalm here is evidentiary: it is Scripture testifying to what the act will do. Footnote 11 adds that the proofs for everything else the shofar draws down are the pesukei shofros. Keep this function in mind — footnote 12 is about to report a source that assigns the psalm a different function entirely, and footnote 62, on the maamar's last page, will reconcile the two.*

עמ' ד

ולכן אומרים מזמור זה קודם תקיעת שופר בכדי להביא ראי' מן התורה[10] על ההמשכה (דעומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים[11]) שע"י תקיעת שופר.

Now, from the fact that what is said before the shofar is not only this verse but the whole psalm, it follows that all the verses of the psalm belong to the matter of His rising from the throne of judgment and sitting on the throne of mercy.[12] *A small inference with a large yield. If the liturgy had isolated verse 6, nothing would follow about verse 5. Because it did not, every line of the psalm is on the subject.* **And all the more so the verse "let Him choose our heritage for us," which stands immediately adjacent to "God has ascended with a teruah" — and that adjacency indicates that this verse belongs to "God has ascended with a teruah."**

עמ' ד

והנה מזה שאומרים לפני תקיעת שופר (לא רק פסוק זה, אלא) את כל המזמור, מובן, שכל הפסוקים דהמזמור שייכים להענין דעומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים שע"י תקיעת שופר[12]. ומכ"ש הפסוק יבחר לנו גו' שהוא בסמיכות להפסוק עלה אלקים בתרועה גו', שזה מורה, שפסוק זה שייך לעלה אלקים בתרועה גו'.

עמ' ד

וצריך להבין, דענין יבחר לנו הוא שהבחירה דהקב"ה בישראל היא מצד עצמו (ולא שהעבודה דישראל מעוררת שיבחור בהם), ויתירה מזו, דענין הבחירה הוא[13] בהעצמות, שאין שייך שם הענין דאתערותא דלתתא. והיינו, דנוסף לזה שהבחירה **בפועל** היא מצד עצמו ולא שמתעוררת ע"י אתעדל"ת, אלא שבמקום זה (שבו הוא ענין הבחירה) **אין שייך כלל** לעורר ע"י אתעדל"ת. וענין עלה אלקים בתרועה גו' הוא, שתקיעת שופר דישראל מעוררת שיהי' עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים. ומהסמיכות דשני הפסוקים משמע דשני הענינים שייכים זל"ז. והיינו, דע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה

And it needs to be understood. "Let Him choose for us" means that the Holy One's choice of Israel is from His own side — and not that Israel's avodah arouses Him to choose them — and more than that: the matter of choice is[13] in Atzmus, where the matter of an arousal from below has no place at all. *Two distinct claims, and the second is the sharp one.* **That is: beyond the fact that the choice *in actuality* is from His own side and is not aroused by an arousal from below, in that place — where choice resides — it is *entirely inapplicable* to arouse by an arousal from below.** *Not "our efforts are insufficient there." The category does not obtain. This is the exact wall the maamar spends nine sections getting through, and the way through will not be a stronger arousal from below.*

And "God has ascended with a teruah" means that Israel's sounding of the shofar arouses Him to rise from the throne of judgment and sit on the throne of mercy. And from the adjacency of the two verses it emerges that the two matters belong to one another. *Which is to say: whatever the shofar does, it does both.*

עמ' ד · סוף ס"ב

הם ממשיכים לא רק הרחמים המתעוררים ע"י עבודה (אתערותא דלעילא שמתעוררת ע"י אתערותא דלתתא), אלא שעי"ז ממשיכים הם גם הרחמים[14] שמצד בחירת הקב"ה בישראל, יבחר לנו.

That is: through Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, they draw down not only the mercies aroused by avodah — an arousal from above that is aroused by an arousal from below — but through this they draw down also the mercies[14] that come from the side of the Holy One's choice of Israel: "let Him choose our heritage for us." *The thesis is now stated and is entirely unexplained. An act of avodah is said to draw something that avodah cannot reach. Sections ג through י"ד exist to make that coherent.*

DEEP DIVE

Two kinds of mercy, and why the difference is not a matter of degree

Mercy aroused by avodah is proportioned to the avodah — the maamar says so explicitly in its final section: *the mercies drawn by an arousal from below are limited, in accordance with the arousal from below.* That is not a complaint about our avodah being small; it is a structural feature of any causal chain. An effect calibrated to its cause carries the cause's measure. Mercy that comes from His choice has no cause outside Himself, and therefore no measure — רחמים בלי גבול. So the two are not the same commodity in different quantities. They are differently constituted, and only one of them can be unbounded. The whole maamar is the mechanism by which a bounded act reaches an unbounded source without becoming its cause.

IN AVODAH

There is a familiar Rosh Hashanah arithmetic: if I daven better, more is granted. It is true, and the maamar affirms it — that is the revealed will, and it is genuinely moved by what we do. But the psalm we say seven times, at the last possible moment before the horn is raised, is not about that arithmetic. It asks for the thing that was never earned and therefore can never be under-earned. Saying it seven times is not emphasis; it is the liturgy insisting on the distinction until we hear it.

SUMMARY

> The psalm is said because verse 6 testifies to what the shofar accomplishes; because the whole psalm is said, verse 5 is on the same subject; and because verse 5 is adjacent to verse 6, the shofar must draw both kinds of mercy. But verse 5 names God's choice, which sits in Atzmus, where an arousal from below is not merely weak but inapplicable. Thesis stated, mechanism owed.

Rosh Hashanah is the building of kingship — and the paradox in the command

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ד–ה

A second approach to the same conclusion, from the character of the day rather than from the liturgy. Rosh Hashanah's core matter is בנין המלכות, the building of kingship: "say before Me verses of kingship so that you make Me King over you." The Gemara elsewhere says the day's mitzvah is the shofar — and the two fit together because the making-King is *effected by* the shofar, as the same statement continues: "and with what? With a shofar." Then the mechanics: the world is brought into being from His attribute of kingship; each year's malchus is drawn for one year only and withdraws at nightfall of erev Rosh Hashanah; the withdrawal is only in the *inwardness* of malchus — its will and delight — which is why the world does not cease but merely goes slack. And since the withdrawal reaches every level, the rebuild must be drawn from the very top. Hence the shofar touches Atzmus. And hence the paradox that the rest of the maamar answers.

And it may be added that the above matter — that through Israel sounding the shofar they draw also the choice of Atzmus, where it is inapplicable to arouse by an arousal from below — is understood also from what is known,[15] that the principal[16] matter of Rosh Hashanah is the building of kingship, as our Sages said:[17] "Say before Me verses of kingship, so that you make Me King over you." *Footnote 16 is worth reading: the Rebbe notes that the Frierdiker Rebbe writes "principal," and reasons that the day also contains remembrances and shofros, but kingship is the chief matter — a small piece of textual care that keeps "principal" from being read as "only."*

עמ' ד · ס"ג

ויש להוסיף, דענין הנ"ל (שע"י שישראל תוקעין בשופר ממשיכים הם גם הענין דבחירת העצמות שאין שייך לעורר שם ע"י אתעדל"ת) מובן גם מהידוע[15] שעיקר[16] ענין ר"ה הוא בנין המלכות, כמאמר רז"ל[17] אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם.

And what they said[18] — that the mitzvah of the day is with the shofar — is because the matter of "that you make Me King over you" comes about *through* the sounding of the shofar,[19] as the continuation of that same statement of the Sages has it: "and with what? With a shofar."[20] *The two Talmudic statements are not rivals. Kingship is the day's content; the shofar is its instrument. Footnote 19 adds Rav Saadya Gaon, brought in the Abudraham, that the first reason among the reasons for the tekios is that by them "we crown the Creator over ourselves" — an independent, non-Chassidic witness that coronation is the primary register of the act.*

עמ' ד

ומה שאמרו[18] מצות היום בשופר הוא, כי הענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא ע"י תקיעת שופר[19], כהמשך מארז"ל הנ"ל ובמה בשופר[20]. והשייכות דר"ה לבנין המלכות (בפשטות) היא[21],

And the connection of Rosh Hashanah to the building of kingship, in its plain sense, is[21] that on Rosh Hashanah there is a renewal of the act of creation, as we say[22] "this day is the beginning of Your works" — that on every Rosh Hashanah all the worlds come into being[23] anew, as it was the first time. And the matter is that the coming-into-being of all the worlds is from His attribute of kingship. *The link is now tight rather than thematic: if the worlds exist out of malchus, and the worlds are re-originated annually, then malchus must be re-established annually. Rosh Hashanah is not a commemoration of creation; it is the load-bearing moment of it.*

עמ' ד–ה

לפי שבר"ה הוא חידוש מעשה בראשית. כמו שאומרים[22] זה היום תחלת מעשיך, שבכל ר"ה מתהוים כל העולמות[23] מחדש כמו שהי' בפעם הראשונה. והענין הוא, דהתהוות כל העולמות היא ממדת מלכותו ית'.

עמ' ה

והמשכת המלכות שבכל ר"ה (כולל גם ר"ה הראשון שבתחלת הבריאה) היא רק על שנה אחת[24], ובערב ר"ה עם חשיכה[25] היא חוזרת ועולה ונכללת במקורה[24]. אלא שהעלי' והסילוק הוא רק בפנימיות המלכות, שהוא התענוג והרצון שבמלכות.

And the drawing of kingship on each Rosh Hashanah — including the first Rosh Hashanah, at the beginning of creation — is only for one year;[24] and on the eve of Rosh Hashanah, at nightfall,[25] it returns and ascends and is subsumed in its source. Except that the ascent and withdrawal are only in the *inwardness* of kingship, which is the delight and the will within kingship. *Footnote 25 is a model of the מוגה register: the Frierdiker Rebbe's Hemshech and Iggeres HaKodesh 14 say erev Rosh Hashanah, while a later passage in the same Iggeres says the night of Rosh Hashanah — and the Rebbe records the divergence rather than harmonising it.*

עמ' ה

והחיות דהעולם בר"ה (גם לפני הענין דתמליכוני עליכם) הוא מחיצוניות המלכות[26], בדוגמת אדם שעושה מלאכה כשהוא עיף ורפה ידים ואין לו תענוג בזה[27]. וכפתגם הידוע[28], שבליל ר"ה (לפני הענין דתמליכוני עליכם) העולם הוא במצב דהתעלפות. וזהו אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם, שיהי' לו רצון ותענוג במלוכה.

And the vitality of the world on Rosh Hashanah — even before the matter of "that you make Me King over you" — is from the *externality* of kingship,[26] like a man doing work when he is weary and slack-handed and takes no pleasure in it.[27] And as the well-known aphorism has it,[28] on the night of Rosh Hashanah, before "that you make Me King over you," the world is in a state of faint. *The image is exact and not decorative. Nothing has stopped; the hands still move. What has gone is the delight that makes the work an expression of the worker. A world running on externality is a world running without anyone's interest in it — which is precisely the condition our davening addresses.*

והנה ידוע[27] שהסילוק שבר"ה הוא בכל המדריגות (מעשה, דיבור, מחשבה, מדות ושכל), דכל הדברים חוזרין לקדמותן. והמשכת המלכות (רצון ותענוג במלוכה) בר"ה היא ע"י שממשיכים מעצמות אוא"ס. ומזה שהענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא ע"י תקיעת שופר כנ"ל, מובן, שתקיעת שופר מגעת בעצמות אוא"ס.

וצריך להבין, הרי תקיעת שופר היא מצוה, וענין הציוויים (מצוות) שייך דוקא לאחרי שהוא ית' נעשה מלך, כמאמר[29] קבלו מלכותי תחלה ואח"כ אגזור עליכם גזירות, ובכדי שיהי' תמליכוני עליכם (שישראל **עושים** אותו ית' למלך) הוא ע"י שמגיעים בעצמות אוא"ס כמו שהוא לפני (למעלה) שנעשה מלך, ואיך אפשר שע"י תקיעת שופר (קיום מצות וציווי המלך) יעשו אותו ית' למלך[30]. ומזה מובן, דבתקיעת שופר שני ענינים, המצוה דתקיעת שופר, וזה שע"י תקיעת שופר מגיעים בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מבחינת מלך.

Now it is known[27] that the withdrawal on Rosh Hashanah is at every level — deed, speech, thought, emotions and intellect — for all things return to their prior state. And the drawing of kingship, the will and delight in reigning, on Rosh Hashanah, comes about by drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light. And since the matter of "that you make Me King over you" comes about through the sounding of the shofar, as above, it follows that the sounding of the shofar reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light. *The inference is from exhaustiveness: a withdrawal that leaves no level untouched cannot be repaired from any level; the resource must be above all of them. Mark the phrase עצמות אוא"ס here — section ה will return to it and insist that this reason, and only this reason, means it literally.*

And it needs to be understood: the sounding of the shofar is a mitzvah, and the matter of commands (mitzvos) belongs specifically to after He, blessed be He, has become King — as it is said,[29] "Accept My kingship first, and afterward I shall decree decrees upon you." And for "that you make Me King over you" to occur — that Israel *make* Him, blessed be He, King — is by reaching the Essence of the Infinite Light as it is prior to (above) becoming King. So how is it possible that through the sounding of the shofar — the fulfilment of a mitzvah and command of the King — they make Him, blessed be He, King?[30] From this it is understood that in the sounding of the shofar there are two matters: the mitzvah of sounding the shofar, and the fact that through the sounding of the shofar one reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the aspect of king. *The objection is not academic: an act commanded by a King already presupposes the King it is meant to install. The Rebbe softens neither horn — the shofar stays a mitzvah, and the coronation stays literal — which is why the sounding must be doing two things at once, not one thing very intensely.*

DEEP DIVE · THE PARADOX

How can obeying the King's command make Him King?

The maamar now raises against itself the objection that governs the next six sections. **The sounding of the shofar is a *mitzvah*; and the matter of commands belongs specifically to the stage *after* He has become King** — as the Sages put it,[29] *accept My kingship first, and afterwards I shall decree decrees upon you*; and Berachos 13a in the same register: one accepts the yoke of heaven first and only then the yoke of mitzvos. **And for "that you make Me King over you" to occur — for Israel to *make* Him King — requires reaching the Essence of the Infinite Light as it is *before* and above becoming King. So how can the sounding of the shofar, which is the fulfilment of a command of the King, be what makes Him King?**[30]

The circularity is genuine, not rhetorical: the act presupposes the state it is said to produce. And note what the Rebbe does *not* do. He does not resolve it by saying the mitzvah is unusually powerful, nor by saying the coronation is figurative. He accepts both horns: **from this it follows that in the sounding of the shofar there are two matters — the mitzvah of sounding the shofar, and the fact that through the sounding of the shofar one reaches the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the aspect of "king."** Two matters in one act. Section ח will name the third and show how all three attach to different levels of the divine will; footnote 30 flags in passing that Rambam's teshuvah reading does not by itself reach this level either, so teshuvah will not be the escape hatch.

IN AVODAH

The state described here is recognisable and is not sin. It is the specific flatness of doing what one has always done with nobody home in it — the world “slack-handed,” running on externality. The maamar’s claim is that this condition arrives annually by design, that it is not a lapse to be ashamed of, and that the response to it is not more effort of the same kind. It is to raise a horn.

SUMMARY

Rosh Hashanah’s principal matter is the building of kingship, effected by the shofar. Each year’s malchus is drawn for a year and withdraws at nightfall of erev Rosh Hashanah — in its inwardness only, which is why the world faints rather than ceases. Since the withdrawal reaches every level, the rebuild is drawn from Atzmus, so the shofar reaches Atzmus. But the shofar is a command, and commands presuppose a King. Therefore the act has two dimensions, and the discourse must account for both.

Kingship is revelation — and why the deepest descent needs the highest root

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ה–ו

A different reason, from elsewhere, for why building malchus requires a drawing from Atzmus — and this reason will turn out to prove something weaker than the reason in section ג. Malchus means *revelation*. Within each sefirah there is a malchus, which is that sefirah's power to reveal; but revelation into the created worlds requires malchus as a partzuf standing on its own, the way speech reveals a person to another. Rosh Hashanah's building of malchus aims at revelation not merely in the spiritual creatures but in physical Asiyah, down to the inanimate: *let every deed know that You made it*. Hence the mitzvah is a physical act, using an animal's horn, and the horn must be detached — inanimate. Then the governing principle: the further down a drawing reaches, the higher its root. The analogy is the power of abstraction in wisdom, and the Rebbe pauses on why the maamar chose the parable-case rather than the compression-case.

עמ' ה · ס"ד

והנה במק"א[31] מבואר הטעם על זה שבכדי שיהי' בנין המלכות הוא ע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס, כי מלכות ענינה הוא גילוי. וגם המלכות שבכל ספירה ענינה הוא כח הגילוי של הספירה[32].

Now, elsewhere[31] the reason is explained for why the building of kingship requires the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light: because kingship's matter is *revelation*. And the kingship within each sefirah is likewise that sefirah's power of revelation.[32] *The source is the Rebbe Rashab's ד"ה שיר המעלות ממעמקים 5671 in Hemshech Ayin-Beis — the great treatment of malchus as the faculty of disclosure rather than a rank of authority.*

עמ' ה–ו

אלא שהגילוי ע"י המלכות דהספירות הוא באצילות[33], ובכדי שיהי' הגילוי בבי"ע הוא ע"י המלכות כמו שהיא פרצוף בפ"ע. ע"ד הדיבור שבאדם (מלכות הו"ע הדיבור, מלכות פה[34]) שהוא גילוי לזולתו.

Except that the revelation effected by the kingship *of the sefiros* is within Atzilus;[33] and for revelation to occur in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, it comes about through kingship *as it is a partzuf in its own right* — comparable to speech in a person (kingship being the matter of speech: "kingship is the mouth"[34]), which is revelation to another. *The distinction is the hinge of the section. A faculty of self-expression internal to a system discloses within that system. Disclosure to something genuinely outside requires a dedicated organ — and an organ is a diminishment, which is exactly why it can reach outsiders. Tikkunei Zohar's Pasach Eliyahu is the locus for "kingship is the mouth."*

עמ' ו

וענין בנין המלכות שבר"ה הוא[35], שהגילוי יהי' לא רק בנבראים דבי"ע הרוחניים אלא גם בעשי' הגשמית, ובזה עצמו – למטה מטה, עד בהדומם, כמו שאומרים בתפלות ר"ה וידע **כל** פעול כי אתה פעלתו, שגם הדומם (שבעשי')[36] ידע כי אתה פעלתו.

וזהו אמרו לפני מלכיות כדי שתמליכוני עליכם כו' ובמה בשופר,

And the matter of the building of kingship on Rosh Hashanah is[35] that the revelation should be not only in the spiritual creatures of Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, but also in physical Asiyah — and within that, lower and lower still, down to the inanimate, as we say in the Rosh Hashanah prayers: "and let *every* deed know that You made it,"[36] that even the inanimate should know that You made it. *Footnote 36 does the philological work: "deed" refers to Asiyah, per the Arizal's siddur and Mishnas Chassidim, brought in Likkutei Torah; and "every deed" extends to the inanimate within Asiyah. The word carrying the entire claim is kol.*

דמהטעמים על זה שאין מספיק אמירת מלכיות וצריך גם לתקוע בשופר, הוא[37], כי הענין דתמליכוני שבר"ה הוא שיומשך הגילוי בעשי', וזה נעשה ע"י תקיעת שופר במעשה. וע"י שהמעשה דתקיעת שופר הוא שתוקעין בשופר של בהמה, נמשך הגילוי גם בענינים הגשמיים, בהמה שבאדם. ובכדי שיומשך הגילוי למטה יותר עד בהדומם, צריך שקרן השופר שבו תוקעין יהי' תלוש (ולא מחובר להבהמה), דומם.

והנה כל שההמשכה היא למטה יותר, הוא ע"י ששורש ההמשכה הוא למעלה יותר. וכמובא[38] הדוגמא לזה מכח ההפלאה שבחכמה, שהירידה היא כפי אופן ההפלאה. שבכדי להוריד את השכל ולהלבישו במשל (ושהמשל יהי' מכוון) הוא דוקא כשיודע את עצם הענין. ולהעיר, שבכח הירידה דשכל שני ענינים. שביכלתו **לצמצם** את השכל שיהי' לפי ערך התלמיד, ושביכלתו **להעלים** את השכל ע"י שמלבישו במשל. וגם בכדי לצמצם את השכל צריך לכח עליון יותר. ויש לומר, דהטעם שמביא בהמאמר ענין הירידה דהתלבשות במשל, הוא, כי מדבר כאן בכח **ההפלאה** (הפשטה) שבחכמה, ובענין זה נוגע יותר הירידה דהתלבשות במשל. דהגם שענין **ההתלבשות** במשל (משא"כ הירידה דצמצום) הוא לכאורה **היפך** ענין ההפלאה, מ"מ, בזה שמלביש את השכל במשל ניכר ומתגלה כח ההפלאה דחכמה. דזה שהתלבשות במשל הוא היפך ההפלאה הוא כשההפלאה היא מוגדרת ומצויירת בהציור דלמעלה מהתלבשות במשל, אבל מצד אמיתית ענין ההפלאה, אפשר להיות גם התלבשות במשל.

ויש לומר, דהגילוי שע"י המלכות כמו שהיא בהספירות דז"א, גילוי באצילות, הוא ע"ד הירידה דצמצום, והגילוי שע"י המלכות כמו שהיא פרצוף בפ"ע, גילוי בבי"ע, הוא ע"ד הירידה דהתלבשות במשלים[39].

And this is "say before Me verses of kingship so that you make Me King over you… and with what? With a shofar": among the reasons that saying the verses of kingship does not suffice and one must also sound the shofar is[37] that the making-King of Rosh Hashanah is that the revelation be drawn into Asiyah — and this comes about through the sounding of the shofar *as a deed*. And since the deed of sounding the shofar is done by blowing the horn of an animal, the revelation is drawn also into physical matters, into the animal within man. And in order that the revelation be drawn lower still, down to the inanimate, the horn one blows must be detached — not attached to the animal — inanimate. *A remarkable piece of reasoning: the halachic requirement that the shofar be a detached horn is read as the mechanism by which the disclosure reaches all the way down. The material of the mitzvah is not incidental to what the mitzvah does.*

Now, the extent to which a drawing reaches lower is a function of how much higher its root is. And the example brought for this[38] is the power of abstraction in wisdom: the descent is according to the mode of the abstraction, for to bring an idea down and clothe it in a parable — and have the parable be accurate — is possible specifically when one knows the thing itself. And it should be noted that there are two powers in the descent of an idea: the ability to compress it to the student's measure, and the ability to conceal it by clothing it in a parable — and even to compress requires a higher power still. And it may be said that the reason the maamar brings the matter of the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is that it is speaking here of the power of abstraction (removal) within wisdom, and in that matter the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is more relevant. For although the matter of clothing in a parable — unlike the descent of compression — would seem to be the very opposite of abstraction, nevertheless, by clothing the idea in a parable the power of wisdom's abstraction becomes recognized and revealed. For that clothing-in-a-parable is the opposite of abstraction is true only when abstraction is defined and pictured as that which is above clothing-in-a-parable; but from the standpoint of the true nature of abstraction, clothing in a parable, too, is possible. *The compression/parable distinction will matter again: only the harder, seemingly self-contradicting route — hiding an idea inside a story rather than merely shrinking it — actually proves how far above the story the idea sits.*

And it may be said that the revelation effected by kingship as it is within the sefiros of Za, revelation in Atzilus, is comparable to the descent of compression; and the revelation effected by kingship as a partzuf in its own right, revelation in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, is comparable to the descent of clothing-in-parables.[39]

DEEP DIVE

The two ways to lower an idea — and why the maamar picks the harder one

Now, every drawing that goes lower does so by virtue of its root being higher. The analogy brought[38] is **the power of abstraction in wisdom: the descent is according to the mode of the abstraction — for to bring an idea down and clothe it in a parable, and to have the parable be accurate, is possible specifically when one knows the thing itself.**

Then a precision. **There are two powers in the descent of an idea: to *compress* it so it fits the student's measure, and to *conceal* it by clothing it in a parable. And even to compress requires a higher power.** So why does the maamar reach for the parable rather than the compression? **Because it is speaking here of the power of *abstraction* — of remove — and in that matter the descent of clothing-in-a-parable is more to the point.** Here is the paradox the Rebbe wants: **although clothing in a parable seems the very *opposite* of abstraction, nevertheless, in clothing the idea in a parable the power of wisdom's abstraction is precisely what becomes visible.** And the resolution: **the notion that clothing-in-a-parable contradicts abstraction holds only when abstraction is itself *defined* and pictured as "that which is above parable." From the standpoint of what abstraction truly is, clothing in a parable is possible too.**

Read slowly, this is a claim about definitions. An abstraction that *cannot* descend is not maximally abstract; it is merely located high — which is a location, and therefore a limit. True remove is not a position above the low but freedom from position. That principle, established here about a teacher and a parable, is the principle the maamar will apply in section ט to the divine will itself.

And from this the greatness of the drawing by which kingship is built — and especially the building of kingship on Rosh Hashanah — is understood: it is not defined by the definition and picture of "above clothing," and therefore, by that drawing, the revelation is drawn and clothed even in Beriah, Yetzirah and Asiyah, and within them even in the inanimate — that even the inanimate should know that You made it.

עמ' ו · סוף ס"ד

ומזה מובן גודל העילוי דההמשכה שעל ידה נעשה בנין המלכות (ובפרט בנין המלכות דר"ה) שאינה מוגדרת בהגדר והציור דלמעלה מהתלבשות, שלכן, ע"י המשכה זו, נמשך ומתלבש הגילוי גם בבי"ע, ובבי"ע עצמם – אפילו בדומם, שגם הדומם ידע כי אתה פעלתו.

IN AVODAH

The horn is detached, dead matter, and that is not a concession — it is the reach. The lowest, most inert thing a person can put to his lips is the instrument by which the year's kingship is built. Whatever in one's own life is the flattest, least spiritual, most stubbornly inanimate portion is, by this logic, not the part left outside the day's work. It is the part that proves how high the drawing came from.

SUMMARY

Kingship is revelation; revelation into the created worlds needs kingship as a partzuf of its own, like speech. Rosh Hashanah aims that revelation into physical Asiyah down to the inanimate — hence a physical act, an animal's horn, detached. And since a lower descent requires a higher root, the drawing that builds malchus must be undefined even by the definition "above clothing." That is why it reaches the inanimate.

Two reasons, two addresses, one phrase

BEFORE WE READ

The shortest section in the maamar and, for a reader trying to learn how the Rebbe reads a text, the most instructive. Sections ג and ד both concluded that the building of malchus requires a drawing from עצמות אוא"ס. The Rebbe now shows that the two arguments do not license the same conclusion. Section ד's argument is proportional: the deeper the descent, the higher the root — which means the descent stands in a *relation* to that root, and is even its display. But anything that stands in a relation to something is not that thing's essence. So section ד proves only the הפלאה of the Infinite Light. It is section ג's argument — that the withdrawal is at *every* level, so the resource must be higher than any level — that requires Atzmus literally. Same phrase in the derushim; two different referents, distinguished by which argument you are running.

And it may be said that according to this explanation — that the reason the building of kingship requires a drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light is that a descent to the very lowest, in the mode of clothing, comes about through the drawing of a wondrous power that is undefined — the descent, which is the revelation of kingship, stands in a *relation* to that wondrous power. For since its wondrousness consists in its not being defined by the picture of "above," and its being able also to descend below, the descent below is itself the revelation of its wondrousness. *The logic is exact. If the descent displays the power, the descent is commensurate with it — not equal to it, but on its scale. And a scale is a definition.*

עמ' ז · ס"ה

ויש לומר, דלפי ביאור זה, שהטעם שבכדי שיהי' בנין המלכות הוא ע"י המשכה מעצמות אוא"ס הוא כי בכדי שתהי' ירידה למטה מטה (ובאופן דהתלבשות) הוא ע"י המשכת כח מופלא שאינו מוגדר, הירידה (הגילוי דמלכות) יש לה יחס לגבי כח המופלא. דכיון שההפלאה שלו הוא שאינו מוגדר בהציור דלמעלה דוקא וביכלתו גם לירד למטה, הרי הירידה למטה הוא גילוי ההפלאה שלו.

And more than this: the revelation of its wondrousness is also in the *manner* of the descent — for the more wondrous it is, the further down it can descend. *This tightens the relation from existence to degree: not merely that the descent shows the power, but that the depth of the descent measures it. A quantity that measures another is bound to it.*

עמ' ז

ויתירה מזו, שגילוי ההפלאה שלו הוא גם **באופן** הירידה. דכל שהוא מופלא יותר ביכלתו לירד למטה יותר.

And from this it follows that what is written in the discourses in which this explanation is given — that on Rosh Hashanah the drawing must be from the Essence of the Infinite Light — is intended to mean the *wondrousness* of the Infinite Light, that which is undefined, and *not* Atzmus itself. *The reading is corrected without any suggestion that the discourses erred. They said what their argument supported. A reader who imports the maximal sense of the phrase is the one making the mistake.*

עמ' ז

ומזה מובן, דמ"ש בהדרושים (שמבואר בהם ביאור זה) שבר"ה צ"ל ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס, הכוונה בזה היא להההפלאה דאוא"ס (שאינו מוגדר), ולא להעצמות ממש.

עמ' ז · סוף ס"ה

משא"כ להביאור דלעיל (סעיף ג) דהטעם שהמשכת המלכות בר"ה צריכה להיות מעצמות אוא"ס הוא לפי שעליית וסילוק המלכות היא בכל הדרגות (ולכן צריכה להיות ההמשכה ממקום נעלה ביותר), ההמשכה היא מעצמות אוא"ס ממש.

Whereas according to the explanation above, in section ג — that the reason the drawing of kingship on Rosh Hashanah must be from the Essence of the Infinite Light is that the ascent and withdrawal of kingship occur at *every* level, and therefore the drawing must come from the loftiest place — the drawing is from the Essence of the Infinite Light *literally*. *Note why this argument survives: it is not proportional. It does not say the resource is high enough to reach low; it says every graded place is itself in withdrawal, so nothing graded is available. What is left is not the top of the scale but what is off it.*

DEEP DIVE · METHOD

Why this section is the spine of the maamar

Three things are worth taking from these few lines.

First, the discipline. A phrase in the sources — עצמות אוא"ס — is doing duty for two different things, and the way to tell which is to ask what work the surrounding argument needed it to do. The Rebbe is not resolving a contradiction between texts; he is refusing to let a term's strongest sense be borrowed by an argument that only earned its weaker sense. This is the same habit as footnote 25 recording the erev/leil divergence and footnote 16 pausing on the word "principal."

Second, the criterion. What disqualifies section ד's argument is that it establishes a *relation*. Relation of any kind — even the relation "that which can reach anywhere" — is a description, and Atzmus is precisely what no description reaches. A power defined as unlimited is still defined by unlimitedness. This is why the maamar's eventual answer will not be "an infinitely great arousal from below," which would still be an arousal, but something that is not an arousal at all: the soul's essence, which does not act on Atzmus because it never left it.

Third, the payoff. Section ט will re-use this exact distinction inside the divine will: the absolute will *as it bears on* the revealed will is its הפלאה — the undefined power that can be moved even by the incommensurate — while the absolute will *itself* is free choice, which stands in no relation to anything. Two faces, mapped onto teshuvah and onto the soul's essence respectively. Section ה is the tool; section ט is the tool in use.

IN AVODAH

There is a devotional habit of reaching for the largest available word — Atzmus, infinite, essence — as though intensity of expression were depth of contact. This section is a quiet correction. The measure of how far something reaches is not how high we say it comes from; it is what argument we can actually make. Said before the shofar, that is a request for accuracy rather than fervour, and the maamar treats accuracy as the more serious form of reverence.

SUMMARY

Section ד's reason is proportional: the descent displays and even measures the wondrous power, so it stands in relation to it. Anything in relation is not Atzmus. So in those discourses "Essence of the Infinite Light" means the הפלאה of Ohr Ein Sof. Only section ג's reason — total withdrawal at every level — requires Atzmus literally.

Two matters in the day, and the question the maamar exists to answer

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ז–ח

Rosh Hashanah carries two renewals. Its core is that man was created on this day, and each year the creation of man is renewed — *you are called "man."* And because man is the purpose of creation, on the day of man's creation the whole creation, made on the twenty-fifth of Elul, is renewed as well. The Rebbe reads the Musaf line accordingly: "this day is the beginning of Your works" refers to man, the principal of His works, created on this very day; "a remembrance of the first day" refers back to the twenty-fifth of Elul, when the world was made. Hence the building of malchus serves both: the worlds' re-emergence, and — principally — the bringing-forth of souls, since souls and malchus are one matter. Which produces the sharpest question in the discourse, and its answer in a single clause.

עמ' ז · ס"ו

והנה ידוע[40] שבר"ה שני ענינים. עיקר ענין ר"ה (א' בתשרי) הוא שביום זה נברא האדם, ובכל שנה ביום זה מתחדש הענין דבריאת האדם, אתם[41] קרויין אדם[42].

Now it is known[40] that Rosh Hashanah has two matters. The principal matter of Rosh Hashanah — the first of Tishrei — is that on this day man was created; and every year, on this day, the matter of the creation of man is renewed: *you*[41] *are called "man."*[42] *The proof-text does specific work. Yevamos 61a's "you are called adam" is applied in Likkutei Torah to Israel, so "the creation of man" renewed each year is not an anthropological fact about the species but the renewal of the Jew as the day's subject.*

עמ' ז–ח

ועוד ענין בר"ה, דכיון שהאדם הוא תכלית הבריאה, לכן, בכל שנה, ביום בריאת האדם, מתחדשת גם כללות הבריאה שנבראה בכ"ה באלול[43].

And a further matter in Rosh Hashanah: since man is the purpose of creation, therefore, every year, on the day of man's creation, the creation as a whole — which was created on the twenty-fifth of Elul[43] — is also renewed. *The ordering is a claim about causation, not chronology. The world is renewed on man's day because the world is renewed through what man is for. Which is why section י"ד can later say that what reaches the soul reaches the world.*

עמ' ח

וי"ל דזהו מ"ש זה היום תחלת מעשיך זכרון ליום ראשון, דזה היום תחלת מעשיך קאי על האדם[44] (עיקר מעשיך) שנברא ביום זה עצמו, וזכרון ליום ראשון הוא שבר"ה הוא זכרון ליום ראשון דהבריאה (כ"ה באלול) שבו נברא העולם.

And it may be said that this is the meaning of "this day is the beginning of Your works, a remembrance of the first day": "this day is the beginning of Your works" refers to man,[44] the principal of Your works, who was created on this day itself; and "a remembrance of the first day" means that Rosh Hashanah is a remembrance of the first day of creation, the twenty-fifth of Elul, on which the world was created. *Footnote 23 flagged earlier that Likkutei Torah reads "beginning of Your works" as the worlds; footnote 44 brings the Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16a, who reads it of the forming of man. Both readings are printed, and the maamar needs both — one for each of the day's two renewals.*

עמ' ח

וזה שבר"ה הוא בנין המלכות הוא בשביל ב' הענינים. בכדי שע"י המלכות יתהוו העולמות מחדש (כנ"ל סעיף ג), ועיקר ענין בנין המלכות הוא בשביל תולדת הנשמות (בריאת האדם), דנשמות ומלכות הם ענין אחד[45] כמובן גם מזה שהמלכות נקראת כנסת ישראל.

And the fact that on Rosh Hashanah there is the building of kingship serves both matters: so that through kingship the worlds should come into being anew, as above in section ג — and the principal matter of the building of kingship is for the bringing-forth of souls, the creation of man, for souls and kingship are one matter,[45] as is understood also from kingship being called "the assembly of Israel." *The identification is not metaphor. If souls and malchus are one, then the annual withdrawal of malchus is the annual withdrawal of the ground of the souls — which is what makes the next paragraph a crisis rather than a curiosity.*

עמ' ח

ועפ"ז, בכדי לפעול שיהי' בנין המלכות צריכים להמשיך ממקום שאין שם (לא רק מציאות העולמות, אלא שאין שם) גם המציאות דנשמות. וצריך להבין, איך שייך שהנשמות ע"י עבודתם יגיעו למקום שלמעלה ממציאותם.

ונקודת הביאור בזה, דזה שבעת סילוק המלכות (בהדרגות שלמעלה ממלכות) אין תפיסת מקום לכאורה לנשמות ועבודתם (כי נשמות ומלכות הם ענין אחד), הוא בנוגע **להמציאות** דנשמות, וענין תמליכוני (שישראל מבקשים ומתחננים להקב"ה שיהי' מלך) הוא הביטול פנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה[46], שמושרשת בהעצמות. וכשמתגלית עצם הנשמה היא ממשכת את העצמות. ועי"ז נעשה גם בנין המלכות.

Accordingly, in order to effect the building of kingship, one must draw from a place where there is not only no existence of worlds, but no existence *of souls* either. And it needs to be understood: how is it possible that souls, by their avodah, should reach a place that is above their own existence? *This is the question the entire discourse converges on. Section ג asked how a subject can crown its own King; this asks how a being can act above the level at which it exists. Both are versions of the same impossibility, and both get the same answer.*

And the nucleus of the explanation is this: the fact that at the time of the withdrawal of kingship — in the levels above kingship — there is seemingly no place for souls and their avodah, since souls and kingship are one matter, applies to the *existence* of souls. Whereas "that you make Me King" — Israel asking and pleading with the Holy One that He be King — is the inner self-nullification that comes from the *essence* of the soul,[46] which is rooted in Atzmus. And when the essence of the soul is revealed, it draws Atzmus. And through this the building of kingship also comes about. *The pivot is מציאות vs. עצם: what cannot climb above its own existence is the soul-as-something; what was never confined to that existence in the first place is the soul's essence, and that is what the plea reaches from.*

DEEP DIVE · THE NUCLEUS

The answer in one clause — and the footnote that carries it

And the nucleus of the explanation is this: the fact that at the time of the withdrawal of kingship — in the levels above kingship — there is seemingly no place for souls and their avodah, since souls and kingship are one matter, applies to the *existence* of souls. Whereas "that you make Me King" — Israel asking and pleading with the Holy One that He be King — is the inner self-nullification that comes from the *essence* of the soul,[46] which is rooted in Atzmus. And when the essence of the soul is revealed, it draws Atzmus. And through this the building of kingship also comes about.

The question dissolves rather than being solved. A soul does not reach above its existence; what acts here is not its existence. מציאות — the soul as a something, a defined entity with an avodah of its own — is indeed co-extensive with malchus and withdraws with it. עצם הנשמה is not a higher grade of the same thing; it is the soul as it never departed from Atzmus. Which is why the operative word is *bittul*: not effort applied upward, but the dropping away of the self-as-something, at which point what is left is already there. And notice what תמליכוני is here revealed to be — not a declaration but a plea. Asking and pleading is the posture of someone who has nothing to offer, and that is precisely its power.

Footnote 46 attaches at the phrase "the essence of the soul," and it is the single most compressed note in the maamar — it locates this entire mechanism in the physical shape of the horn. It is treated in full in the commissioned deep dives at the back of this edition.

IN AVODAH

Two very different things can happen while a person stands and pleads before the shofar. One is the summoning of feeling — an achievement, a מציאות, and a real one. The other is the moment the summoning gives out and what is left is only asking. The maamar's claim is that the second is not the failure of the first. It is the part that arrives where nothing else can.

SUMMARY

Rosh Hashanah renews man, and through man the world; the Musaf line names both. Malchus is built for both, chiefly for the souls — souls and malchus being one. So the drawing must come from where souls do not exist either. How can a soul's avodah reach above its own existence? It cannot, and need not: what acts is not the soul's existence but its essence, rooted in Atzmus, revealed through bittul.

Israel arose in the Essential Thought

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ח

Having claimed that the soul's essence is rooted in Atzmus, the Rebbe now grounds the claim in the midrashic statement that Israel arose in the divine thought — read, as it is in many places, as *essential* thought. The argument runs through a distinction: ordinary thought about a thing is beneath the thinker and therefore effectively outside him; Israel's is one with the thinker Himself. This is used to explain the consultation — "with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous" — as a consultation not only about creating worlds but about the very *thought* of creating them, which places the souls above that thought. An objection follows, and its answer produces the section's most important idea: two modes within essential thought, of which Israel are the second. The section closes by tying the whole thing back to malchus.

עמ' ח · ס"ז

וביאור הענין דבנין המלכות שנעשה ע"י המשכת העצמות שע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה, יש לומר, ע"פ המבואר בכ"מ[47] בענין ישראל עלו במחשבה[48], דמחשבה זו היא מחשבה עצמית.

And the explanation of the building of kingship that comes about through the drawing of Atzmus by way of the revelation of the essence of the soul may be given on the basis of what is explained in many places[47] concerning "Israel arose in thought"[48] — that this thought is *essential* thought. *The midrashic phrase in Bereishis Rabbah is that Israel arose in the divine thought prior to creation. The Chassidic tradition reads "thought" here not as deliberation but as a level: מחשבה עצמית, thought that has not separated from the one thinking.*

עמ' ח

דמחשבה בכלל היא מחוץ להחושב [וכמו אדם החושב איזה דבר, דהמחשבה בהדבר היא למטה מהאדם עצמו, ובמילא היא כמו חוץ ממנו], והמחשבה דישראל היא חד עם החושב עצמו.

For thought in general is outside the thinker — as with a man thinking of some thing: the thought about that thing is beneath the man himself, and consequently is as though outside him — whereas the thought of Israel is one with the thinker Himself. *The bracketed reasoning supplies the criterion of "outside," and it is not spatial. What is beneath a person is thereby external to him: an object of his attention rather than a mode of him. Thought about the world is like that. Israel are not.*

וזהו במי נמלך בנשמותיהן של צדיקים[49] (ועמך כולם צדיקים[50]), שההמלכה דבמי נמלך היא לא רק על בריאת העולמות (אם לברוא עולמות או לא לברוא), אלא גם על המחשבה להתהוות העולמות (אם תהי' המחשבה להתהוות העולמות או לאו), דמזה מובן, שנשמות ישראל (שבהם נמלך אם תהי' המחשבה דבריאת העולמות) הם למעלה ממחשבה זו. כי המחשבה דבריאת העולמות, גם כמו שהיא בדרגא הכי נעלית, היא דוגמת אדם החושב איזה דבר (מחשבה **לברוא עולמות**), שהמחשבה היא חוץ ממנו, וישראל עלו במחשבה עצמית. ומבואר שם, דהטעם על זה שההמלכה על המחשבה דבריאת העולמות היתה עם ישראל שעלו במחשבה עצמית (אף שמחשבה עצמית היא למעלה מהמחשבה דבריאת העולמות), הוא, כי במחשבה עצמית שני אופנים. שחושב אודות עצמו, ושחושב בדבר הנבדל ממנו ואעפ"כ אין המחשבה חוץ ממנו כי **הוא עצמו** הוא החושב. וזה שישראל עלו במחשבה הוא אופן הב' שבמחשבה עצמית, שהעצמות חושב כביכול בדבר הזולת [וזהו בנים אתם להוי' אלקיכם[51], דכיון ששורש הנשמות הוא במחשבה העצמית, **שהעצמות** חושב כביכול **בדבר הזולת**, לכן, גם לאחרי שבאו בהמשכה הם כמו בנים, שבבן (דוגמת) שני ענינים הנ"ל. שהבן הוא נבדל מהאב ואעפ"כ יש בו מעצמיות האב]. ולכן ההמלכה על המחשבה דעולמות היתה עם ישראל. כי הכוונה דבריאת העולם [**שהתחתונים** יהיו **דירה לו ית'**] נשלמת ע"י הנשמות.

And this is "with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous"[49] — and "your people are all righteous"[50] — that the taking of counsel was not only about the creation of the worlds, whether to create worlds or not to create, but also about the *thought* of the worlds coming into being, whether there should be such a thought or not. From which it follows that the souls of Israel, with whom He took counsel as to whether there should be a thought of creating the worlds, are above that thought. *The bracketed alternative — "your people are all righteous" — extends the midrash from an elite to every Jew, and the maamar relies on that extension in section א, where what is drawn is drawn to every single Jew.* **For the thought of creating the worlds, even as it is at its loftiest level, is comparable to a man thinking of some thing — a thought *to create worlds* — where the thought is outside him; whereas Israel arose in essential thought.**

And it is explained there that the reason the taking of counsel on the thought of creating the worlds was with Israel, who arose in essential thought (even though essential thought is above the thought of creating the worlds), is that in essential thought there are two modes: that He thinks about Himself, and that He thinks about something separate from Him and nevertheless the thought is not outside Him, because He Himself is the one thinking. And Israel's arising in thought is the second mode of essential thought — that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other. [And this is "you are children to Havayah your God,"[51] since the root of the souls is in essential thought, in which the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other; therefore, even after they have come forth in a drawing-down, they are like children — for in a son there are, by way of analogy, the two matters just named: the son is separate from the father, and nevertheless has in him the father's own essence.] And therefore the taking of counsel about the thought of the worlds was with Israel — for the intent of the creation of the world, that the lower realms be a dwelling for Him, blessed be He, is completed through the souls. *The move from thought to sonhood is the load-bearing step: essential thought that includes an other is precisely the structure of a child, who is both genuinely separate and yet carries the parent's own essence — which is why "bonim" rather than any other relational word is the Torah's term here.*

DEEP DIVE

The objection, and the two modes of essential thought

If the souls are above the thought of creating worlds, why was the consultation about that thought held with them at all? The maamar answers by opening the term. **In essential thought there are two modes: that He thinks about Himself, and that He thinks about something separate from Him and nevertheless the thought is not outside Him, because *He Himself* is the one thinking. And Israel's arising in thought is the second mode of essential thought — that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other.**

The distinction repays attention. The intuitive picture of "essential thought" is self-reflection: God thinking about God, with nothing external involved. That picture would make it impossible for anything other than God to be in essential thought — and would make Israel's presence there incomprehensible. The second mode breaks that picture. What makes a thought essential is not the *topic* being the thinker but the *thinker* being present without remove. The object can be genuinely other, and the thought still not be outside Him.

The proof-text is the maamar's own: **"you are children to Havayah your God"[51] — since the root of the souls is in essential thought, in which *the Essence* thinks, as it were, *about an other*, therefore even after they have come forth in a drawing-down they are like children; for in a son there are, by analogy, the two matters just named: the son is separate from the father, and nevertheless has in him the father's own essence.** Sonhood is precisely the coincidence of genuine otherness with unbroken essence — which is why it is the right analogy and why *bonim* is the Torah's word for the relation.

And so: **therefore the consultation about the thought of the worlds was with Israel — for the purpose of the creation of the world, that *the lower realms* be *a dwelling for Him*, is completed through the souls.**

And it may be said that the relation of souls to kingship, as they are in their root in essential thought, is this: that the Essence thinks, as it were, about an other *is itself the very pattern of kingship* — for kingship pertains specifically to an other: "there is no king without a people."[52] *This is the section's structural payoff and it is easy to read past. The soul's root and the mechanism of kingship are not two facts that happen to be connected; they are one structure. "Essence oriented to an other" is what malchus means.*

עמ' ח · סוף ס"ז

ויש לומר, שהשייכות דנשמות למלכות כמו שהם בשרשם במחשבה העצמית, היא, דזה שהעצמות חושב כביכול בדבר הזולת הוא דוגמת המלכות, דענין המלכות הוא על זולת דוקא, אין מלך בלא עם[52].

And on this basis one may explain why the revelation of the essence of the soul, which comes about through the sounding of the shofar, effects the building of kingship: because when the root of the soul is revealed as it is in essential thought, thereby the drawing of kingship from its true root, as it is in essential thought, comes about. *Section ו asserted that revealing the soul's essence builds malchus; the assertion is now derived. The soul's root and malchus's root are the same place, and one revelation therefore effects both. Nothing is being transported from one domain to another.*

עמ' ח

ועפ"ז יש לבאר הטעם על זה שע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה (שע"י תקיעת שופר) נעשה בנין המלכות, כי ע"י שמתגלה שרש הנשמה כמו שהיא במחשבה העצמית, נעשה עי"ז המשכת המלכות משרשה האמיתי כמו שהיא במחשבה העצמית.

IN AVODAH

The second mode of essential thought has an implication a person can carry into the day. Being genuinely other than God — a self, with a life, with concerns that are one's own and not obviously about Him — is not the distance from the root. It is the shape of the root. The maamar does not ask a Jew to stop being a separate somebody in order to be close; sonhood is separateness that carries the father's essence. What the shofar reveals is not that the separateness was an illusion, but whose it is.

SUMMARY

> Israel arose in *essential* thought — thought not outside the thinker. Hence the counsel was taken about the very thought of creation, placing the souls above it. The objection (how consult those above it?) is answered by two modes in essential thought: thinking of Himself, and thinking of an other while remaining the thinker — the mode Israel occupy, whence "you are children." And that mode is the pattern of kingship itself, אין מלך בלא עם — which is why revealing the soul's root draws malchus from its true root.

Three levels of will — and the answer to the paradox

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' ט

Back to the debt of section ג. If the shofar works by revealing the soul's root above the whole register of mitzvos, then how does the making-King attach to the shofar precisely *as a mitzvah*? The answer is taken from the Frierdiker Rebbe's Hemshech: in the divine will *"I shall reign,"* there are three levels — revealed will, concealed will, and the absolute will in His essence. They fall into two categories, and the decisive question is which of them an arousal from below can touch, and why it can touch anything at all. That last question yields the answer: an arousal from below has no intrinsic claim on Him whatever; it works only because the absolute will decided that it would — and it decided so in order that His kingship over the worlds be also *from the worlds' side*. Footnote 56 licenses the whole method of arguing this from human kingship.

And it needs to be understood: according to the above, the reason the sounding of the shofar effects "that you make Me King over you" is that through the sounding of the shofar the root of the soul is revealed as it is rooted in Atzmus, which is above the whole matter of mitzvos. Yet from the fact that the sounding of the shofar *is* a mitzvah, it follows that the making-King belongs also to the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar. *The objection is not that section ו was wrong but that it was incomplete. If the essence-revelation were the whole story, the halachic form of the act — that it is commanded, with conditions, in a fixed hour — would be inert. The Rebbe treats the mitzvah's being a mitzvah as data that the explanation must account for.*

This is understood on the basis of what my father-in-law the Rebbe explains in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah,[53] that in the will of "I shall reign" there are three levels: a revealed will, a concealed will, and the absolute will in His very essence. These three levels divide into two categories: the revealed and the concealed are both in revelation within Him Himself, and the difference between them concerns actualization — the revealed will is an arousal that pertains to actualization, while the concealed will is only an assent that does not pertain to actualization, and is therefore called "concealed," being concealed and remote from actualization. And the absolute will in His essence is concealed entirely — meaning, concealed even with respect to Himself. [And this is like the will for a house: every person has — from the essence of his soul, even when he does not know of it — a will for a house, because this touches the very essence of his existence.] *Three, not two: a will already turned toward acting, a settled will that has not, and beneath both a will that isn't an object of awareness at all — hidden not from something else but from Him. The bracketed example is not decoration: the want for a house a person carries without knowing it is exactly the register this third will occupies.*

עמ' ט · ס"ח

וצריך להבין, דלפי הנ"ל זה שע"י תקיעת שופר נעשה הענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא לפי שע"י תקיעת שופר מתגלית שורש הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בהעצמות שלמעלה מענין המצוות, ומזה שתקיעת שופר היא מצוה, מובן, שהענין דתמליכוני עליכם שייך גם להמצוה דתקיעת שופר.

ויובן זה ע"פ מה שמבאר כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל[53], שבהרצון דאנא אמלוך, ג' מדריגות. רצון גלוי, רצון נעלם ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו. וג' מדריגות אלו נחלקות לב' סוגים. דרצון הגלוי והנעלם, שניהם הם בגילוי בו בעצמו, והחילוק שביניהם הוא בנוגע להפועל, דרצון הגלוי הוא בהתעוררות ששייך לפועל, ורצון הנעלם הוא רק הסכם שאינו שייך לפועל (ולכן נק' בשם נעלם, כי הוא נעלם ורחוק מהפועל). ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו הוא נעלם לגמרי, היינו שהוא נעלם גם לגבי עצמו. [וע"ד הרצון לבית, דכל אדם יש לו (מצד עצם נפשו, גם כשאינו יודע מזה) יש לו רצון לבית, כי זה נוגע לעצם מציאותו].

DEEP DIVE · THE THREE WILLS

Revealed, concealed, absolute

This is understood on the basis of what my father-in-law the Rebbe explains in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah:[53] that in the will of "I shall reign" there are three levels — a revealed will, a concealed will, and the absolute will in His very essence. And these three divide into two categories.

The revealed and the concealed are both in revelation within Him Himself, and the difference between them concerns actualization: the revealed will is an arousal that pertains to actualization, whereas the concealed will is only an assent that does not pertain to actualization — and it is therefore called "concealed," being concealed and remote from actualization. *A useful way to hold this: the revealed will is a will that has already turned toward doing; the concealed will is a settled agreement that has not. Both are His and both are known to Him.*

And the absolute will in His essence is entirely concealed — meaning, concealed even with respect to Himself. [And this is comparable to the will for a house: every person has, from the essence of his soul, even when he does not know of it, a will for a house — because this touches his very existence.]

The bracketed analogy is doing precise work and is worth dwelling on. A man asked why he wants a house may produce reasons, and the reasons will be a revealed will. Ask further and there is an assent he could articulate but has never acted from — a concealed will. But beneath both there is something not available to introspection at all, and its inaccessibility is not a deficiency of self-knowledge: it is inaccessible *because* it is not a content of the self but a feature of the self's existing. One cannot survey it, because one is it. That is the register in which "choice" will be located in section ט — and it is why a choice at that level cannot be explained by a reason, since a reason would make it a content.

And a further difference between the revealed will and the concealed will: the arousal of the revealed will comes about through an arousal from below — through Israel accepting upon themselves the yoke of His kingship and asking "reign over the whole world in Your glory." *The liturgical phrase is not ornament: it is the specific arousal from below under discussion, said in Musaf of Rosh Hashanah, and it names what the day's davening is for — the revealed will.*

And this matter — that the arousal of the revealed will comes through an arousal from below — obtained even at the beginning of creation, except that the arousal of the will then came about by way of a raising of "feminine waters" from within itself.[54] As the statement has it, "with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous": through the delight He would take in the avodah of the righteous arising before Him — "your people are all righteous" — the revealed will for kingship was thereby aroused. [Comparable to a flesh-and-blood king, in whom the revealed will to reign is aroused by the people's coronation of him.] *"From within itself" is the hinge: there was no below yet to arouse anything, so the arousal had to originate inside the very thing it would arouse — the souls functioning before they existed as souls.*

עמ' ט

ועוד חילוק בין רצון הגלוי לרצון הנעלם, שההתעוררות דרצון הגלוי הוא ע"י אתערותא דלתתא, ע"י שישראל מקבלים עליהם עול מלכותו ית' ומבקשים מלוך על העולם כולו בכבודך. וענין זה (שהתעוררות רצון הגלוי הוא ע"י אתעדל"ת) הי' גם בתחילת הבריאה, אלא שהתעוררות הרצון אז הי' ע"י העלאת מ"ן מיני' ובי'[54]. כמאמר במי נמלך בנשמותיהן של צדיקים, דע"י שעלה לפניו ית' התענוג שיתענג בעבודת הצדיקים, ועמך כולם צדיקים, עי"ז נתעורר ברצון גלוי למלוכה. [בדוגמת מלך בו"ד, שהרצון (הגלוי) למלוכה מתעורר ע"י הכתרת העם].

DEEP DIVE

An arousal from below before there was anyone below

And this matter — that the arousal of the revealed will comes through an arousal from below — obtained even at the beginning of creation, except that the arousal of the will then came about by way of a raising of "feminine waters" from within itself.[54] As the statement has it, "with whom did He take counsel? With the souls of the righteous": through the delight He would take in the avodah of the righteous arising before Him — "your people are all righteous" — the revealed will for kingship was thereby aroused. [Comparable to a flesh-and-blood king, in whom the revealed will to reign is aroused by the people's coronation of him.]

The difficulty this solves is a real one. If the revealed will requires an arousal from below, and at the beginning there was no below, the will could never have been aroused and nothing would exist. The answer is that the arousal came *from within* — מיני' ובי' — the future avodah of the righteous rising before Him as delight. Which means the very first arousal from below was the souls, before they existed as souls. Note how this fits with section ז: their being in essential thought is exactly the standing that allows them to function before creation. The two sections are describing the same fact in two registers.

And the arousal of the concealed will is not through an arousal from below, but it is aroused of itself. And it is explained there[55] that the fact that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will is not on account of any worth belonging to the arousal from below in itself — for a creature is incommensurate with the Creator, also relative to the level of the revealed will, and all the more so given that the revealed will is in the Infinite Light prior to the tzimtzum — but rather because so it arose in His will, in the concealed will; and higher still, because so it was decided in the absolute will in His essence, that an arousal from below should arouse the revealed will. *This is the theological pivot of the maamar. Our avodah has no purchase, no proportion, no claim. It works because it was decided that it would work. Which means the efficacy of every mitzvah traces not to the mitzvah but to the absolute will — and that is what makes the next paragraph possible.*

עמ' ט

וההתעוררות דרצון הנעלם הוא לא ע"י אתערותא דלתתא אלא שמתעורר מעצמו. ומבאר שם[55], דזה שע"י אתערותא דלתתא מתעורר הרצון גלוי, אין זה מצד מעלת האתעדל"ת מצד עצמה, כי נברא הוא באין ערוך לגבי בורא (גם לגבי הדרגא דרצון הגלוי, ובפרט שגם רצון הגלוי הוא באוא"ס שלפני הצמצום), אלא לפי שכן עלה ברצונו ית' ברצון הנעלם, ולמעלה יותר לפי שכן הוחלט ברצון המוחלט בעצמותו, שאתעדל"ת תעורר את רצון הגלוי.

And it may be said that the reason it was decided in the absolute will that the arousal of the revealed will should come specifically through an arousal from below is in order that His kingship over the worlds should be — also — *from the side of the worlds*. [And comparable to how it is in earthly kingship,[56] where, because the kingship is constituted by the people's coronation — "you shall surely set over yourself a king"[57] — the people's self-nullification before the king is from the side of *their own* reality.[58]] *The bracketed analogy answers a question a careful reader will have been holding since section ג: why should a King who needs nothing arrange to be crowned? Because a kingship imposed on subjects is a kingship they undergo; a kingship they constitute is one they hold from within. The whole apparatus of mitzvos exists so that the relationship should have a side that is ours. Footnote 56 is the warrant for reasoning this way at all, and is treated in full at the back of this edition.*

עמ' ט · סוף ס"ח

ויש לומר, דזה שהוחלט ברצון המוחלט שהתעוררות רצון הגלוי תהי' ע"י אתעדל"ת דוקא, הוא, בכדי שמלכותו ית' על העולמות תהי' (גם) מצד העולמות. [וע"ד כמו שהוא במלכותא דארעא[56], דע"י שהמלכות נעשית ע"י הכתרת העם, שום תשים עליך מלך[57], ביטול העם להמלך הוא מצד המציאות **שלהם**[58]].

עמ' ט

ועפ"ז יובן השייכות דתמליכוני עליכם (גם) להמצוה דתקיעת שופר, כי קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר הוא האתערותא דלתתא שמעוררת את רצון הגלוי. דהביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שבתקיעת שופר, אינו אתערותא דלתתא לעורר את רצון הגלוי, כי ענין אתערותא דלתתא הוא שעבודת **התחתון** (מציאות) מעוררת את ההמשכה. ולכן צריך לשני הענינים. שהאתערותא דלתתא המעוררת את רצון הגלוי הוא קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר. והמשכת רצון המוחלט [דזה שע"י אתערותא דלתתא מתעורר הרצון גלוי הוא לפי שכך הוחלט ברצון המוחלט] הוא ע"י הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שבתקיעת שופר.

And on this basis the belonging of "that you make Me King over you" also to the *mitzvah* of sounding the shofar is understood: for the fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will. Whereas the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul in the sounding of the shofar is *not* an arousal from below that arouses the revealed will — since the matter of an arousal from below is that the avodah of the *lower being*, a defined existence, draws down the flow. And therefore both matters are required: the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will is the fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar; and the drawing of the absolute will — since the fact that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will is because it was so decided in the absolute will — comes about through the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul in the sounding of the shofar.

The paradox of section ג is now dissolved, and elegantly. The act does not make Him King by being a command; nor does it bypass its being a command. The mitzvah is a legitimate arousal from below and moves the revealed will. The bittul inside the same act is not an arousal at all — the essence of the soul is not a "lower being" with avodah to offer — and it draws the absolute will in which the whole arrangement of arousal-and-response was decided. One act, two channels, no circularity: what the mitzvah cannot reach is reached by what is not doing any reaching.

IN AVODAH

Two things are true at once, and the maamar declines to collapse them. What we do genuinely matters — the day's davening is the arousal that moves the revealed will, and it is designed to matter so that the relationship should have our side in it. And what we do has no claim whatever; its mattering was itself a decision. Holding both is the emotional content of Rosh Hashanah: effort taken with complete seriousness, and no leverage claimed from it.

SUMMARY

Three levels in the will "I shall reign": revealed (pertains to actualization, aroused from below), concealed (assent, remote from actualization, self-aroused), and absolute in His essence (concealed even from Himself, like the will for a house). An arousal from below has no intrinsic worth — it works only because the absolute will so decided, in order that His kingship be also from the worlds' side. Hence both dimensions of the shofar: the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; the essence-bittul draws the absolute will that licensed the arousal.

Two faces of the absolute will — and three matters in the shofar

BEFORE WE READ

The tool forged in section ה is now applied to the absolute will itself. It too has an aspect that stands in relation and an aspect that stands in none. As it bears on the revealed will — that an arousal which is utterly incommensurate can nonetheless arouse — it is the הפלאה of Atzmus Ohr Ein Sof, the undefined power that can operate even through the incommensurate. But the absolute will *itself* is free choice: not the display of His wondrousness, but that He chose. And with that distinction the maamar can lay out three matters in the sounding of the shofar and give each its own address. This is the discourse's architectural summit.

Now, in the absolute will too there are two matters. As it stands in relation to the revealed will — that by the drawing of the absolute will, the revealed will is aroused through an arousal from below, even though that arousal is incommensurate — this matter is the *wondrousness* of the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is not defined by any definition, and it is within His power that the arousal should come about even through something incommensurate. [And comparable to what was explained above in section ה regarding wondrousness: that wondrousness consists in being undefined, and in being able to descend below.] *The bracket is the Rebbe's own cross-reference, and it makes the reuse explicit. The same criterion — "undefined, and therefore able to operate at the bottom" — is applied first to the descent of a teaching, then to the descent of revelation into the inanimate, and now to the capacity of an incommensurate act to move Him.*

עמ' י · ס"ט

והנה גם ברצון המוחלט שני ענינים. כמו שהוא בשייכות לרצון הגלוי, שע"י המשכת רצון המוחלט מתעורר הרצון גלוי ע"י אתעדל"ת אף שהאתעדל"ת היא באין ערוך, דענין זה הוא ההפלאה דעצמות אוא"ס שאינו מוגדר בשום גדר וביכלתו ית' שתהי' ההתעוררות גם ע"י ענין שבאין ערוך [וע"ד המבואר לעיל (סעיף ה) בענין ההפלאה, שההפלאה היא זה שאינו מוגדר וביכלתו לירד למטה].

ורצון המוחלט עצמו, שהוא מצד בחירת העצמות. דזה שהוחלט אצלו לרצות כך הוא לא מפני שעי"ז מתגלה ההפלאה שלו, אלא שכן בחר בבחירתו החפשית.

ויש לומר, דזהו שבתקיעת שופר ג' ענינים (בכללות). המצוה שבה, ענין התשובה[59], והביטול פנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה. שקיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר הוא האתעדל"ת המעוררת את הרצון גלוי (כנ"ל). וע"י התשובה דתקיעת שופר, דענין התשובה הוא שיוצא מההגבלות שלו, נמשך ההפלאה (בל"ג) שבעצמות אוא"ס, שההתעוררות (דרצון הגלוי) הוא ע"י ענין שבאין ערוך, רצון המוחלט שבנוגע לרצון הגלוי. וע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה שע"י תקיעת שופר נמשך רצון המוחלט עצמו, בחירת העצמות.

And the absolute will *itself*, which is from the side of the choice of Atzmus: that it was decided by Him to will thus is not because His wondrousness is thereby revealed, but because so He chose, in His free choice. *Everything in the maamar has been building to this sentence, and it is a denial. Even the most exalted available explanation — "so that His wondrousness be displayed" — is refused, because an act done to display something is an act with a reason, and a reason is a relation. Free choice has no "because." This is also the precise sense in which the verse's יבחר could not be aroused from below: not too high to reach, but of a kind that has no input.*

And it may be said that this is why there are, in general, three matters in the sounding of the shofar: the mitzvah in it; the matter of teshuvah;[59] and the inner self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul. The fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will, as above. And through the teshuvah of the sounding of the shofar — teshuvah being that one goes out of one's own limitations — the wondrousness, the boundlessness, in the Essence of the Infinite Light is drawn: that the arousal of the revealed will comes about through something incommensurate, the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will. And through the revelation of the essence of the soul that comes about by the sounding of the shofar, the absolute will *itself* is drawn — the choice of Atzmus. *One blast, three registers at once: the halachic act reaches the revealed will, teshuvah's self-transcendence reaches the boundlessness within the revealed will, and the bare fact of the soul's essence being revealed reaches the choice itself — nothing earns that third reach, it is simply uncovered.*

DEEP DIVE · THE THREE-TIER MAP

Three matters in the sounding of the shofar

And it may be said that this is why there are, in general, three matters in the sounding of the shofar: the mitzvah in it; the matter of teshuvah;[59] and the inner self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul.

The fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will, as above.

And through the teshuvah of the sounding of the shofar — teshuvah being that one goes out of one's own limitations — the wondrousness, the boundlessness, in the Essence of the Infinite Light is drawn: that the arousal of the revealed will comes about through something incommensurate; the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will.

And through the revelation of the essence of the soul that comes about by the sounding of the shofar, the absolute will *itself* is drawn — the choice of Atzmus.

The correspondence is not decorative; each term earns its address. *Mitzvah* is an act of a defined being, so it moves what is aroused by defined beings. *Teshuvah* is defined as going out of one's limits — a movement of the incommensurate as such — so it draws precisely the aspect of the absolute will under which the incommensurate can move Him. And *the soul's essence* is not a movement at all, so it corresponds to what has no input: the choice. Footnote 30, back in section ג, warned that teshuvah alone does not arrive at this level; here we can see exactly which level it does arrive at, and what remains above it.

One further observation. All three are present in every tekiah of every year — this is not a hierarchy of spiritual attainment in which some people reach the third tier. The mitzvah is fulfilled by the halachic act; the teshuvah is the day's theme; the essence-bittul is the pleading that the maamar identified with תמליכוני in section ו. A Jew who blows or hears the shofar is doing all three at once, whether or not he can name them.

IN AVODAH

The three matters correspond to three things a person can honestly bring, and they are ordered by decreasing capability. There is what I can do — the mitzvah, exactly as prescribed. There is what I can attempt beyond my measure — teshuvah, going out past my own limits. And there is what I cannot do at all, which is the plea, and which reaches highest. The day does not ask a person to choose among them.

SUMMARY

The absolute will has two faces: as it bears on the revealed will it is the הפלאה of Atzmus Ohr Ein Sof, undefined and therefore able to be moved even by the incommensurate; and itself it is free choice, chosen for no reason at all, not even to display His wondrousness. Hence three matters in the shofar, each with its own address: the mitzvah arouses the revealed will; teshuvah draws the הפלאה; the revealed essence of the soul draws the choice itself.

Why everything is dismantled every year

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' י

One paragraph, and it reframes the entire day. Section ג described the annual collapse as a fact to be repaired: malchus withdraws, the world faints, and we must draw a new kingship down. The Rebbe now asks for the *inner* reason the collapse happens at all — and answers that the collapse is the mechanism, not the malfunction. Because the rebuild has to be routed through אמרו לפני מלכיות, and the pleading is the bittul of the soul's essence which draws the absolute will itself, a higher revelation is drawn into the world than the world would otherwise carry. The annual demolition exists so that the reconstruction must pass through the one place that upgrades everything downstream. Footnote 60 closes the circuit back to section ז.

And it may be said that the inner reason for the fact that on every Rosh Hashanah all things return to their prior state is this: because the drawing of kingship — including the drawing of kingship that is for the sake of the worlds — comes about through "say before Me verses of kingship," the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul, which reaches and draws the absolute will itself, therefore through this a loftier revelation is drawn into the world as well. *The inversion is complete. The reason for the withdrawal is not any deficiency in last year's kingship; it is that a rebuild is the only thing that requires the plea, and the plea is the only thing that reaches the choice. To get the higher light into the world annually, the world has to be put in a position where nothing less will do.*

עמ' י · סעיף יו"ד

ויש לומר, דהטעם הפנימי על זה שבכל ר"ה חוזרים כל הדברים לקדמותם, הוא, כי ע"י שהמשכת המלכות (גם המשכת המלכות שבשביל העולמות) היא ע"י אמרו לפני מלכיות, הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה שמגיע וממשיך את רצון המוחלט עצמו, עי"ז נמשך גילוי נעלה יותר גם בעולם.

For although with respect to the worlds it is, in the main, the drawing of the *revealed* will, nevertheless — since the arousal and drawing of the revealed will, by an arousal from below, comes about *through* the drawing of the absolute will effected by the self-nullification stemming from the essence of the soul — something of the same kind is drawn into the world too. And through this the purpose of the creation of the worlds is completed: that there be a dwelling for Him, blessed be He, in the lower realms.[60] *The operative phrase is מעין זה — "something of the same kind." The world does not receive the absolute will; it is not built to. But because the channel it receives through was itself opened from there, a trace of that origin arrives with the flow. That trace is what makes the world a dwelling rather than merely a well-run creation: a dwelling is where the resident is himself, not merely where his provisions reach.*

עמ' י · סוף הסעיף

דהגם שבנוגע לעולמות הוא (בעיקר) המשכת הרצון גלוי, מ"מ, כיון שהתעוררות והמשכת רצון הגלוי (ע"י אתעדל"ת) הוא ע"י המשכת רצון המוחלט שע"י הביטול שמצד עצם הנשמה, נמשך מעין זה גם בעולם. ועי"ז נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות, שיהי' דירה לו ית' בתחתונים[60].

DEEP DIVE

The design argument, stated plainly

Set the pieces side by side and the maamar's architecture becomes visible as a single decision.

The absolute will decided that the revealed will would be aroused from below, *so that the kingship should have a side that belongs to the world* (section ח). But an arousal from below reaches only the revealed will, and the revealed will is bounded. So if that were the whole arrangement, the world would be governed but never elevated: each year's kingship would be a competent renewal at the same altitude, and mercy would always be proportioned to the arousal that fetched it.

Hence the annual withdrawal at *every* level (section ג) — which makes the arousal from below insufficient by construction, and forces the day's avodah to include a plea, which is not an arousal but a bittul, which reaches the choice itself. And because the world's revealed will is now being drawn *through* a channel opened at that height, the world receives more than its own register can generate.

So the collapse is instrumental, and the two apparent problems of the maamar answer each other. The world needs a side of its own — that is why there are mitzvos. The world's side is too small to reach the top — that is why there is a collapse that makes its smallness unavoidable and its plea necessary. Rosh Hashanah is the annual engineering of a situation in which the only available move is the one that reaches highest.

IN AVODAH

The faint that section ג described — the year gone slack, last year's vitality withdrawn, the sense of standing before the day with nothing carried over — is, on this reading, not evidence of failure and not even a hardship to be endured. It is the condition being arranged so that the plea is real. A person who arrives at Rosh Hashanah feeling that he has nothing to offer has, by the maamar's own account, arrived correctly.

SUMMARY

The inner reason for the annual return of all things to their prior state: the rebuild is routed through the pleading of "say before Me verses of kingship," which is the essence-bittul that draws the absolute will itself. So although the world receives chiefly the revealed will, something of that higher origin comes with it — and thereby the purpose of creation, a dwelling for Him in the lower realms, is completed. The dismantling is the design.

The answer: both Sanctuaries, and mercy without bound

BEFORE WE READ

עמ' יא

The closing section returns to the verse and pays every debt. The request said before the tekios is now legible: that the shofar's avodah yield — beyond the mitzvah and beyond the teshuvah — the revelation of the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus, rooted there because He freely chose. Revealed where? In the point of Jewishness in the heart, the Sanctuary of Yaakov. And since section יו"ד established that the essence-revelation reaches the world and completes it as a dwelling, the two readings of section א meet: the inward Sanctuary and the Third Beis HaMikdash are the same request at two ends of one process. Then the final move — the adjacency of section ב, and why these mercies are without measure.

And this is "let Him choose our heritage for us, the pride of Yaakov": the request of this verse — and likewise of the psalm as a whole — which is said before the sounding of the shofar, is that through the avodah of sounding the shofar there should be, in addition to the fulfilment of the mitzvah of sounding the shofar and the matter of the teshuvah of sounding the shofar, also the revelation of the essence of the soul as it is rooted in Atzmus. For the fact that the souls are rooted in Atzmus is because so He chose, in His free choice — "let Him choose for us." *The verse's verb is finally explained. יבחר is not asking Him to make a decision now; it is naming the ground of what we are asking to have revealed. We ask for the disclosure of a rootedness whose only cause is His choosing — which is why the request had to be said in a verse about choice and not about mercy.*

עמ' יא · ס"יא

וזהו יבחר לנו את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב, שהבקשה דפסוק זה (ועד"ז בכללות המזמור) שאומרים קודם תקיעת שופר היא, שע"י העבודה דתקיעת שופר תהי' (נוסף על קיום המצוה דתקיעת שופר, וענין התשובה דתקיעת שופר) גם גילוי עצם הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בהעצמות, דזה שהנשמות מושרשות בהעצמות הוא לפי שכן בחר בבחירתו החפשית, יבחר לנו.

And the verse continues "our heritage, the pride of Yaakov," for the revelation of this matter takes place in the point of Jewishness — "our heritage" — which rests in the point of the heart of every single Jew: the Sanctuary of Yaakov. *Section א's reading is now not merely correct but necessary. The soul's essence has to be revealed somewhere, and the only site in a person that is not an achievement is the point of the heart. What is rooted in Atzmus by choice can only surface where nothing was constructed.*

עמ' יא

וממשיך את נחלתינו את גאון יעקב, דגילוי ענין זה הוא בנקודת היהדות, נחלתינו, השורה בנקודת הלב שבכ"א מישראל, בית מקדשא דיעקב.

עמ' יא

וע"פ המבואר לעיל (סעיף יו"ד) שע"י גילוי שרש הנשמות נמשך מעין גילוי זה גם בעולם שעי"ז נשלמת הכוונה דדירה בתחתונים, יש לבאר הקשר דהפירוש שגאון יעקב קאי על בית המקדש שבכ"א מישראל עם הפירוש שקאי על ביהמ"ק השלישי, כי עיקר הענין דדירה בתחתונים יהי' בביהמ"ק השלישי[61] שיבנה במהרה בימינו ע"י משיח צדקנו.

And on the basis of what was explained above in section יו"ד — that through the revelation of the root of the souls something of that revelation is drawn into the world as well, whereby the purpose of a dwelling in the lower realms is completed — one may now explain the connection between the interpretation that "the pride of Yaakov" refers to the Beis HaMikdash within every Jew and the interpretation that it refers to the Third Beis HaMikdash: for the principal realization of a dwelling in the lower realms will be in the Third Beis HaMikdash,[61] which will be built speedily in our days by Moshiach Tzidkeinu. *The question of section א is answered, and the answer is a mechanism rather than a harmonization. The inward Sanctuary is where the revelation lands; the Third Sanctuary is where the revelation's effect on the world is consummated. One request, tracked from its point of entry to its final address — which is why a Jew asking for his own heart to be uncovered is, in the same words, asking for the Temple.*

עמ' יא

ויש לומר, שנוסף על השייכות דהפסוק יבחר לנו גו' לכללות הענין דתקיעת שופר, יש לו שייכות מיוחדת להפסוק (שלאחריו) עלה אלקים בתרועה הוי' בקול שופר, שדרשו חז"ל דע"י שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין לפני הקב"ה הוא עומד מכסא דין ויושב בכסא רחמים[62]. והענין הוא, דהרחמים הנמשכים ע"י אתעדל"ת הם בהגבלה כפי האתעדל"ת.

And it may be said that beyond the relation of the verse "let Him choose for us" to the general matter of sounding the shofar, it has a particular relation to the verse that follows it — "God has ascended with a teruah, Havayah with the sound of a shofar" — concerning which our Sages expounded that by Israel taking up their shofros and sounding them before the Holy One, He rises from the throne of judgment and sits upon the throne of mercy.[62] And the matter is this: the mercies drawn down by an arousal from below are limited, in accordance with the arousal from below. *Section ב's adjacency is now cashed. It was never only that both verses concern the shofar; the first verse is what makes the second verse's mercy unbounded.*

עמ' יא · סיום המאמר

והקשר דשני הפסוקים הוא, דזה שישראל נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין הוא לא רק אתעדל"ת אלא שעי"ז מתגלה בחירת העצמות בישראל, ולכן הרחמים הנמשכים עי"ז הם רחמים בלי גבול. ונמשך מהקב"ה עצמו (מהעצמות) לכאו"א מישראל כתיבה וחתימה טובה לשנה טובה ומתוקה בטוב הנראה והנגלה.

And the connection of the two verses is this: that Israel's taking up their shofros and sounding them is not only an arousal from below, but through it the choice of Atzmus in Israel is revealed — and therefore the mercies drawn down by it are mercies *without bound*. And there is drawn from the Holy One Himself, from Atzmus, to every single Jew, a good inscription and sealing for a good and sweet year, in good that is visible and revealed.

The closing is not a formula appended to an argument; it is the argument's conclusion. Because what the shofar reveals is a choice rather than a response, the mercy it draws carries no measure from below — and because it comes from Atzmus, it comes to every single Jew without differentiation, exactly as section ז's "your people are all righteous" already required. The last four words locate it: not a lofty good that must be trusted, but good that is visible and revealed.

IN AVODAH

The verse said seven times before the tekios turns out to be the most audacious line in the day's liturgy. It does not ask for a favourable verdict, and it does not offer anything in exchange. It asks Him to disclose a choice He made for no reason, and it asks for the disclosure in the one place inside a person that he did not build. Everything else on Rosh Hashanah has a measure. This does not.

SUMMARY

> The request before the tekios: that the shofar reveal the soul's essence as rooted in Atzmus — rooted there by free choice, יבחר לנו — in the point of Jewishness in the heart, נחלתינו. Since that revelation reaches the world and completes it as a dwelling, the inward Sanctuary and the Third Beis HaMikdash are one request at two ends. And because the shofar reveals a choice and not merely an arousal, the mercy it draws is without bound, and comes from Atzmus to every Jew.

Three footnotes that carry more than they look like

Notes 46, 56 and 60 are each a single sentence. Between them they supply the maamar's physical anchor, its licence to reason as it does, and the closing of its circuit. Each is given in full below, then unpacked.

FOOTNOTE 46 · ATTACHED IN SECTION ו, AT "THE ESSENCE OF THE SOUL"

The narrow end of the horn

ורמז בחינה זו בשופר הוא המיצר שבו – לא מיצר דעוונות, כ"א זה שהוא "עם" ולא במרחב העצמות ששם מושרש. ולכן זה נוגע בהעצמות (עיין ד"ה שה"מ בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל. המשך ר"ה תרצ"ה בסופו).

"And the hint of this aspect in the shofar is the constriction in it — not the constriction of transgressions, but rather that it is a 'people' and not in the expanse of Atzmus, where it is rooted. And this is why it touches Atzmus." *Sources: ד"ה שיר המעלות in the aforementioned Hemshech Rosh Hashanah; Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695 at its end.*

What the note is denying

The standard Chassidic reading of the shofar's shape runs through מן המצר קראתי י־ה ענני במרחב י־ה — "from the straits I called; He answered me with expanse" (Psalms 118:5). The narrow end is the straits from which one cries; the flare is the answer. And in most treatments the straits are the straits of sin and exile: a person constricted by what he has done, crying out from that constriction. The Rebbe's note excludes that reading in five words: לא מיצר דעוונות — *not* the constriction of transgressions.

The exclusion is required by the argument. Section ו has just said that what draws Atzmus is not the soul's מציאות but its עצם, and that what surfaces is bittul rather than avodah. A cry from guilt is a cry of a defined self about its record — precisely a מציאות at work, and precisely the register of teshuvah, which section ט will assign to a lower address (the הפלאה, not the choice). If the horn's narrowness meant guilt, the horn would illustrate the wrong tier of the maamar.

What the note substitutes

The constriction the horn hints at is the constriction of *being an "am" at all* — a people, a something, an existent standing over against Him — rather than being in מרחב העצמות, the expanse of Atzmus where the soul is rooted. This is a constriction with no fault in it. Nothing has gone wrong. The soul is cramped because it is a self, and a self is by definition not an expanse.

And note the word chosen for the cramp: "עם", in quotation marks in the printing. That is not a neutral synonym for "creature." It is the word from אין מלך בלא עם — the very term section ז identified as the pattern of kingship, and section ח as the reason the whole arousal-from-below arrangement was instituted (so that the kingship should be *from the world's side*). So the horn's narrow end is the soul experiencing itself as the *am* of "there is no king without a people": as the other that the Essence thinks about, in the second mode of essential thought.

Why it therefore "touches Atzmus"

The note's last clause is a *therefore*, and it is the tightest step in the maamar. Why should the pain of being a self reach higher than the pain of having sinned? Because of what each one is a pain *about*. Guilt is answerable within the system: there is a remedy, a process, a proportion — which is exactly why it draws a proportioned response. The constriction of being an "am" has no remedy inside the system at all; nothing that can be done to a self makes it an expanse. Its only relief is the expanse it came from. A lack whose only

possible satisfaction is Atzmus is a lack that touches Atzmus — and the sources the note points to, the Rebbe Rashab's ד"ה שיר המעלות and the end of Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695, are where that mechanism is developed.

The physical fact behind the whole discourse

A shofar is blown from the narrow end and sounds from the wide one. Breath enters at the מיצר and emerges into מרחב. Set that beside the maamar's final sentence — the mercies drawn by an arousal are bounded by the arousal, but these are רחמים בלי גבול, without bound — and the instrument turns out to be a diagram of the argument. Bounded at the point of contact with the person; unbounded at the point of emergence. And what makes the difference is not the force of the breath but where it was applied.

This is also the most compressed weld in the maamar. Note 46 sits at section ו's clause about the soul's essence, and in one line it ties that clause to section ז's מחשבה עצמית (the Essence thinking of an other), to section ח's אין מלך בלא עם (why there had to be an other), and to section יא's boundless mercy — through the geometry of a horn. A reader who skips the footnotes loses the only place where the discourse's three levels are shown occupying one physical object.

Status. The מיצר/מרחב pair is the language of Psalms 118:5 — VERIFIED. The two internal locators the note gives (ד"ה שה"מ within the Frierdiker Rebbe's Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, and Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5695 at its end) are real works reproduced as the printing gives them; their internal placement is not independently confirmed here — AS CITED. The reading of "עם" as deliberately picking up אין מלך בלא עם is this edition's elucidation, not the note's statement; the note supplies the quotation marks, and the inference is left to the reader.

FOOTNOTE 56 · ATTACHED IN SECTION ח, AT "EARTHLY KINGSHIP"

The licence to argue from a human king

שהיא כעין מלכותא דרקיע (ברכות נח, א), שלכן "ממלכותא דארעא יש לבאר ולהסביר ענין מלכותא דרקיע" (המשך ר"ה הנ"ל רפ"ב – ע' 6).

"For it is of the pattern of the heavenly kingship (Berachos 58a) — which is why 'from earthly kingship one may explain and clarify the matter of heavenly kingship.'" *Quoting the Frierdiker Rebbe, Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, beginning of section 2, p. 6.*

The objection it pre-empts

Section ח has just made a claim of some consequence: that the reason the absolute will instituted arousal-from-below is so that His kingship should be *from the world's side* — and it supports the claim with a bracketed analogy from human politics, where the kingship is constituted by the people's coronation and the subjects' submission therefore proceeds from their own reality.

A trained reader should balk. Analogies from human interiority are everywhere in Chassidus, but here the analogy is not illustrating a conclusion already reached by other means — it is *carrying* the conclusion. Why should the sociology of an earthly monarchy be evidence about the structure of the absolute will? Note 56 answers, and the answer is not "because it is a helpful image."

The answer: derivation licenses inference

Berachos 58a states that earthly kingship is כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — patterned on the heavenly kingship. Human monarchy is therefore not a metaphor selected for convenience; it is a downstream instance of the same structure, formed after it. And that is what makes the inference legitimate in the reverse direction: because the earthly was derived from the heavenly, the earthly can be read to explain the heavenly. The Frierdiker Rebbe's formulation, quoted in the note, states the entitlement explicitly — one *may* explain and clarify the heavenly from the earthly.

So the direction of inference is licensed by the direction of derivation. That is a compact and quite general epistemological claim, and it is the ground beneath a great deal of Chassidic argument. It is not that God is like a king; it is that kings are like God, from which it follows that one can learn upward.

The same principle the maamar already used, in section ד

Note 56 is not an isolated methodological aside. Section ד established, at length, that a parable is accurate only when its author knows the thing itself — that the descent into a mashal is a real descent of the idea and not an ornament attached to it, which is precisely why the power of abstraction becomes *visible* in the parable. Note 56 is that same doctrine applied to the maamar's own procedure. A mashal drawn from the human case is a genuine descent of the structure it illustrates; therefore reading it carefully is reading the structure, not guessing at it.

Which means the maamar's reliance on human interiority throughout — the teacher lowering an idea to a student, the weary worker with no delight in his work, the man who has a will for a house he cannot introspect, the people crowning a king — is not a series of pedagogical concessions. On the maamar's own account, each of those is a licensed instrument for reading the thing above. Note 56 is where that licence is filed.

Status. Berachos 58a as the locus of מלכותא דארעא כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — VERIFIED; it is the standard citation for the dictum. The quoted sentence from the Frierdiker Rebbe's Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, and its internal locator (beginning of section 2, p. 6), are reproduced as the

printing gives them — AS CITED. Note that this same page-6 locator is cited again at note 53 for the three levels of will, which is internally consistent: both are drawn from the Hemshech's opening sections.

FOOTNOTE 60 · ATTACHED IN SECTION יו"ד, AT "A DWELLING FOR HIM IN THE LOWER REALMS"

The circuit closing

וע"ד המובא לעיל ס"ז, שההחלטה על ההמשכה דבריאת העולמות היתה ע"י ישראל שעלו במחשבה העצמית, כי ע"י ישראל דוקא נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות.

"And comparable to what was brought above in section ז — that the decision regarding the drawing-forth of the creation of the worlds came about through Israel, who arose in essential thought, because it is specifically through Israel that the purpose of the creation of the worlds is completed."

A cross-reference that is an argument

The note is entirely internal: it points from the maamar's penultimate claim back to its seventh section. But the pointing does work that neither section states on its own.

Section יו"ד has just said that the world's annual rebuild is routed through the soul's essence-bittul, so that something of the absolute will reaches the world, and thereby the world is completed as a dwelling. Note 60 says: this is *of the same order as* what was said in section ז, where the decision about world-creation itself was taken through the souls who arose in essential thought — for the identical reason, that the purpose of creation is completed specifically through Israel.

Set the two side by side and a symmetry appears that neither passage announces. At the **input** end — before creation, in the consultation במי נמלך — the decision to draw the worlds forth was taken through Israel. At the **output** end — every Rosh Hashanah, in the plea before the shofar — the world's renewal and elevation come through Israel. Same reason on both ends. The Jew is not a beneficiary positioned inside a plan that was settled elsewhere; the Jew is the reason the plan resolves, at its origin and at every one of its annual restarts.

Where it leaves section ו's question

Section ו asked how souls could, by their avodah, reach a place above their own existence. Section ו answered mechanically: not the soul's existence but its essence, which is rooted in Atzmus. Note 60 converts that mechanism into something closer to a definition. The souls do not *reach* above their existence at any point — their root was never inside it, which is why the pre-creation consultation could be held with them at all. The same fact that makes the annual plea effective is what made the original decision possible. Nothing travels; something is uncovered.

A note on the מוגה layer

Note 60 belongs to a small set of footnotes in this maamar whose whole content is a cross-reference inside the discourse itself — notes 13, 30, 59, 60 and 62 all point to other sections of the same text (לעיל ס"ז, לקמן ס"ט, דלעיל הערה 30, כנ"ל). These are the visible seams of the editing: a maamar as delivered orally does not carry an index to itself. They are, for a student, the most valuable notes in the apparatus, because they are the author telling you which parts he considered load-bearing on which. Note 60 is the last of them, and it ties the end to the middle.

Status. An internal cross-reference whose referent is on the page — VERIFIED against section ז of this same maamar. The דירה בתחתונים formulation the note attaches to is the standard midrashic phrase; this maamar does not supply a locator for it and none is supplied here, since

> a citation not printed should not be invented for the apparatus. Where a reader wants one, it should be taken from the source he actually checks.

FOOTNOTE 56 · ATTACHED IN SECTION ח, AT "EARTHLY KINGSHIP"

The licence to argue from a human king

שהיא כעין מלכותא דרקיע (ברכות נח, א), שלכן "ממלכותא דארעא יש לבאר ולהסביר ענין מלכותא דרקיע" (המשך ר"ה הנ"ל רפ"ב – ע' 6).

"For it is of the pattern of the heavenly kingship (Berachos 58a) — which is why 'from earthly kingship one may explain and clarify the matter of heavenly kingship.'" *Quoting the Frierdiker Rebbe, Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, beginning of section 2, p. 6.*

The objection it pre-empts

Section ח has just made a claim of some consequence: that the reason the absolute will instituted arousal-from-below is so that His kingship should be *from the world's side* — and it supports the claim with a bracketed analogy from human politics, where the kingship is constituted by the people's coronation and the subjects' submission therefore proceeds from their own reality.

A trained reader should balk. Analogies from human interiority are everywhere in Chassidus, but here the analogy is not illustrating a conclusion already reached by other means — it is *carrying* the conclusion. Why should the sociology of an earthly monarchy be evidence about the structure of the absolute will? Note 56 answers, and the answer is not "because it is a helpful image."

The answer: derivation licenses inference

Berachos 58a states that earthly kingship is כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — patterned on the heavenly kingship. Human monarchy is therefore not a metaphor selected for convenience; it is a downstream instance of the same structure, formed after it. And that is what makes the inference legitimate in the reverse direction: because the earthly was derived from the heavenly, the earthly can be read to explain the heavenly. The Frierdiker Rebbe's formulation, quoted in the note, states the entitlement explicitly — one *may* explain and clarify the heavenly from the earthly.

So the direction of inference is licensed by the direction of derivation. That is a compact and quite general epistemological claim, and it is the ground beneath a great deal of Chassidic argument. It is not that God is like a king; it is that kings are like God, from which it follows that one can learn upward.

The same principle the maamar already used, in section ד

Note 56 is not an isolated methodological aside. Section ד established, at length, that a parable is accurate only when its author knows the thing itself — that the descent into a mashal is a real descent of the idea and not an ornament attached to it, which is precisely why the power of abstraction becomes *visible* in the parable. Note 56 is that same doctrine applied to the maamar's own procedure. A mashal drawn from the human case is a genuine descent of the structure it illustrates; therefore reading it carefully is reading the structure, not guessing at it.

Which means the maamar's reliance on human interiority throughout — the teacher lowering an idea to a student, the weary worker with no delight in his work, the man who has a will for a house he cannot introspect, the people crowning a king — is not a series of pedagogical concessions. On the maamar's own account, each of those is a licensed instrument for reading the thing above. Note 56 is where that licence is filed.

Status. Berachos 58a as the locus of מלכותא דארעא כעין מלכותא דרקיעא — VERIFIED; it is the standard citation for the dictum. The quoted sentence from the Frierdiker Rebbe's Hemshech Rosh Hashanah, and its internal locator (beginning of section 2, p. 6), are reproduced as the

printing gives them — AS CITED. Note that this same page-6 locator is cited again at note 53 for the three levels of will, which is internally consistent: both are drawn from the Hemshech's opening sections.

FOOTNOTE 60 · ATTACHED IN SECTION יו"ד, AT "A DWELLING FOR HIM IN THE LOWER REALMS"

The circuit closing

וע"ד המובא לעיל ס"ז, שההחלטה על ההמשכה דבריאת העולמות היתה ע"י ישראל שעלו במחשבה העצמית, כי ע"י ישראל דוקא נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות.

"And comparable to what was brought above in section ז — that the decision regarding the drawing-forth of the creation of the worlds came about through Israel, who arose in essential thought, because it is specifically through Israel that the purpose of the creation of the worlds is completed."

A cross-reference that is an argument

The note is entirely internal: it points from the maamar's penultimate claim back to its seventh section. But the pointing does work that neither section states on its own.

Section יו"ד has just said that the world's annual rebuild is routed through the soul's essence-bittul, so that something of the absolute will reaches the world, and thereby the world is completed as a dwelling. Note 60 says: this is *of the same order as* what was said in section ז, where the decision about world-creation itself was taken through the souls who arose in essential thought — for the identical reason, that the purpose of creation is completed specifically through Israel.

Set the two side by side and a symmetry appears that neither passage announces. At the **input** end — before creation, in the consultation במי נמלך — the decision to draw the worlds forth was taken through Israel. At the **output** end — every Rosh Hashanah, in the plea before the shofar — the world's renewal and elevation come through Israel. Same reason on both ends. The Jew is not a beneficiary positioned inside a plan that was settled elsewhere; the Jew is the reason the plan resolves, at its origin and at every one of its annual restarts.

Where it leaves section ו's question

Section ו asked how souls could, by their avodah, reach a place above their own existence. Section ו answered mechanically: not the soul's existence but its essence, which is rooted in Atzmus. Note 60 converts that mechanism into something closer to a definition. The souls do not *reach* above their existence at any point — their root was never inside it, which is why the pre-creation consultation could be held with them at all. The same fact that makes the annual plea effective is what made the original decision possible. Nothing travels; something is uncovered.

A note on the מוגה layer

Note 60 belongs to a small set of footnotes in this maamar whose whole content is a cross-reference inside the discourse itself — notes 13, 30, 59, 60 and 62 all point to other sections of the same text (לעיל ס"ז, לקמן ס"ט, דלעיל הערה 30, לעיל ס"ז, כנ"ל). These are the visible seams of the editing: a maamar as delivered orally does not carry an index to itself. They are, for a student, the most valuable notes in the apparatus, because they are the author telling you which parts he considered load-bearing on which. Note 60 is the last of them, and it ties the end to the middle.

Status. An internal cross-reference whose referent is on the page — VERIFIED against section ז of this same maamar. The דירה בתחתונים formulation the note attaches to is the standard midrashic phrase; this maamar does not supply a locator for it and none is supplied here, since

> a citation not printed should not be invented for the apparatus. Where a reader wants one, it should be taken from the source he actually checks.

וכל אדם

ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' באהל מועד · שבת האזינו, שבת תשובה ה'תשכ"ג · editorial status undetermined

Let No One Be Present

> *A high priest enters the Holy of Holies once a year, and for that one entry even the angels have no standing.*

The argument at a glance

Nine moves, one question: an ordinary mitzvah — the Yom Kippur atonement — reaches a place no angel can stand in. What makes a commanded act touch the uncommandable?

QUESTION	א	No one — not even an angel with a human face — may be in the Ohel Moed when the Kohen Gadol enters to atone. The Tzemach Tzedek reads this through שמיני: circumcision, given on the eighth day, is above the chain of worlds, and it is circumcision's merit that admits the Kohen Gadol. So the room's own revelation predates and outranks the atonement-service itself — why then does the exclusion attach specifically to the *service*, not the room?
LADDER	ב	Answered through a ladder of "eighths": the eighth of circumcision, the eighth of teshuvah (which forgives what mitzvos cannot reach), and the eighth of Yom Kippur itself — the "one" sprinkling above the seven, done *before* them, not after. An eighth that follows seven still belongs to the seven it completes; an eighth that precedes them belongs to nothing But the source.
ROOT	ג–ה	Mitzvos draw down the name Havayah into a world made through the concealing name Elokim. Teshuvah is commanded by "Anochi" — a name above Havayah itself. Four tribunals are asked how a sinning soul is atoned: Chochmah says death, Nevuah says suffering, Torah says a sacrifice, and only the Holy One says teshuvah — because only His own answer draws from a source with no measure at all.
NOT EARNED	ו	The pivot is a distinction between *tov* and *chesed*: chesed answers merit, tov answers nothing but its own giving. Teshuvah's atonement is tov, not chesed — which is exactly why it can reach a sin that, by definition, earned nothing.
BEYOND WILL	ז	Yom Kippur's own atonement — "the day itself atones" — goes a level further than teshuvah. Teshuvah answers for having acted against the *will*; the day itself reveals the essence of the soul bound to the Essence, a level where the category of "flaw" never applied to begin with.
WHY THREE	ח	The three eighths ranked: circumcision's light was always meant to be drawn — no real novelty. Teshuvah's light is new — it answers a breach that was never supposed to happen. Yom Kippur's own atonement is newer still — beyond even the Willer of the will.
ANSWER	ט	So the exclusion is precise: the room's own revelation still has a connection to the chain of worlds, and angels have standing there. But the Kohen Gadol's *service* of atonement reaches the bond between the soul's essence and the Essence itself — and there, not even an angel with a human face has a place.
CODA	—	Ne'ilah reveals this more than Mussaf; and the same bond — Yosef's self-revelation to his brothers, no one else present — is why Shemini Atzeres is "for you," and not for outsiders.

SECTION 1

No one may be there

BEFORE WE READ

Vayikra 16 sets the Yom Kippur service: the Kohen Gadol alone enters the Holy of Holies, and the verse says flatly that no one else may be in the Ohel Moed while he does. A midrash sharpens "no one": not even the creatures on the Divine Chariot who have a human face — the highest-ranking angels there are. The Tzemach Tzedek's own maamar on this verse is the source the Rebbe builds from here, and its key move is reading "the eighth day" (when circumcision is given) as a technical term: a level of revelation that stands outside the whole chain of worlds (השתלשלות), not merely high within it.

"And no one shall be in the Ohel Moed when he comes to atone in the Sanctuary…"[1] **And the Yerushalmi says**[2]**: even those of whom it is written**[3] **"and their faces had the likeness of a human face."** *The verse's own "no one" already excludes every ordinary being. The Yerushalmi's addition is the maamar's real subject: it excludes the chayos of the Merkavah, beings so exalted that "human face" is their least imposing feature — precisely the angels most like a Kohen Gadol in what they do.*

סעיף א · 1

וכל אדם לא יהי' באוהל מועד בבואו לכפר בקודש גו'[1] ואיתא בירושלמי[2] אפילו אותן שכתב בהן[3] ודמות פניהם פני אדם.

And the Tzemach Tzedek explains in his own maamar on this verse[4] **that the revelation drawn when the Kohen Gadol entered the Holy of Holies is a revelation above the chain of worlds. And as the midrash has it,**[5] **on the verse**[6] **"with this shall Aharon come" — by what merit did Aharon enter the Holy of Holies? … the merit of circumcision entered with him. And circumcision is given on the eighth day, for "eighth" is above the chain of worlds.** *"Eighth" here is not a date. Seven is the register of the created order — seven days of creation, seven midos. An eighth day names whatever sits outside that register altogether, and it is that credential, not any merit accrued within the seven, that gets the Kohen Gadol through the door.*

סעיף א · 2

ומבאר הצ"צ במאמרו ד"ה זה[4], שהגילוי שנמשך כשכהן גדול הי' נכנס לקודש הקדשים הוא גילוי שלמעלה מהשתלשלות. וכדאיתא במדרש[5] עה"פ[6] בזאת יבוא אהרן, באיזה זכות הי' אהרן נכנס לבית קדשי הקדשים כו' זכות המילה היתה נכנסת עמו, ומילה ניתנה בשמיני, דשמיני הוא למעלה מהשתלשלות.

And as the midrash has it,[7] **on the verse**[8] **"the secret of Havayah is for those who fear Him" — what is "the secret of Havayah"? This is circumcision. For the revelations of the chain of worlds are from the revealed dimension of the Holy One, and the revelation drawn through circumcision is from His concealed dimension, and is therefore called "the secret of Havayah" — for a secret is what is sealed and hidden.** *Two different kinds of hidden. Everything within the chain of worlds is, in some sense, a revealing — even what looks concealed there is concealed relative to a further revelation still inside the same order. This is the other kind: hidden not because it hasn't yet been shown, but because it belongs to a register revelation doesn't reach at all.*

סעיף א · 3

וכדאיתא במדרש[7] עה"פ[8] סוד הוי' ליראיו איזהו סוד הוי' זו מילה. שהגילויים דהשתלשלות הם מבחי' גליא דקוב"ה, והגילוי שנמשך ע"י מילה הוא מבחי' סתים דקוב"ה, ולכן נק' סוד הוי', דסוד הוא מה שהוא סתום ונעלם.

סעיף א · 4

ובשעה שהכה"ג ה' נכנס לקודש הקדשים נמשך הגילוי דסוד הוי'. ולכן לא היו שם אפילו אותן שכתב בהן ודמות פניהם פני אדם, כי לגבי גילוי זה אין מקום לנבראים, אפילו לא להמלאכים שדמות פניהם פני אדם.

And at the hour the Kohen Gadol entered the Holy of Holies, the revelation of "the secret of Havayah" was drawn. And therefore not even those of whom it is written "and their faces had the likeness of a human face" were there — for with respect to this revelation there is no place for creatures at all, not even for the angels whose faces have the likeness of a human face. *The reasoning is exact, not rhetorical inflation: a revelation that belongs to no register of creation has, by the same token, no room for any created thing in it — the highest angel is excluded on exactly the same grounds as the lowest.*

סעיף א · 5

וצריך להבין, דמזה שבכדי שהכהן גדול יוכל ליכנס לקודש הקדשים הוא ע"י זכות המילה שניתנה בשמיני, מוכח, שהגילוי דלמעלה מהשתלשלות שהי' בקדה"ק הוא מצד מעלת קדה"ק עצמו (ולא שע"י כניסתו של הכהן גדול לקדה"ק נמשך הגילוי), ואעפ"כ, זה שוכל אדם לא יהי' גו' אפילו אותן שכתב בהן ודמות פניהם פני אדם הוא דוקא בבואו של הכהן גדול לקדה"ק לכפר בקודש.

And it needs to be understood: from the fact that the Kohen Gadol is able to enter the Holy of Holies specifically through the merit of circumcision, given on the eighth day, it is proven that the above-the-chain-of-worlds revelation that was in the Holy of Holies is from the virtue of the Holy of Holies itself — not that the revelation is drawn by the Kohen Gadol's entry. And nevertheless, the exclusion of "no one shall be there… even those with a human face" applies specifically when the Kohen Gadol comes to atone in the Sanctuary. *The room already has the revelation before anyone walks in — that is what circumcision's merit is a credential for, not a cause of. Which raises the actual question: if the room's own standing is already this high, why does the verse tie the exclusion to the service, not to the room?*

סעיף א · 6

דמזה מובן, שהגילוי שנמשך ע"י העבודה דכהן גדול בקדה"ק הוא נעלה יותר מהגילוי שהי' בקדה"ק מצד עצמו.

From which it is understood that the revelation drawn through the Kohen Gadol's service in the Holy of Holies is loftier than the revelation that was in the Holy of Holies of itself. *This is the whole maamar's engine in one line: the room's revelation, however high, has angels' worth of company. Whatever the service reaches must be higher still — high enough that the question becomes not "why exclude angels here too" but "what is it about an act of atonement that could possibly outrank the place it happens in."*

SUMMARY

The room's own revelation, real as it is, still has room for angels. The exclusion belongs to the *service* — meaning the Kohen Gadol's atonement-work reaches somewhere higher than the room's own standing. The rest of the maamar is the explanation of what that "somewhere" is, and why an ordinary mitzvah gets there.

SECTION 2

A ladder of eighths

BEFORE WE READ

The Tzemach Tzedek's maamar (the base text here, as Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 was for the sibling on Rosh Hashanah) reads "eighth" as a technical term for above-the-chain revelation, and now stacks three instances of it: the eighth of circumcision, the eighth of teshuvah, and the eighth that is Yom Kippur itself. The stack matters because it is about to split into two kinds of eighth — one that comes after seven and belongs to them, and one that comes before seven and does not.

סעיף ב

This is understood on the basis of what is explained in the maamar[9]: that teshuvah (and atonement[10]) are in the category of "eighth," above the chain of worlds. For teshuvah is great, for it brings healing to the world[11] — and healing was set in the eighth [blessing of the Amidah][12], and its being set in the eighth follows the pattern[13] of circumcision, given on the eighth. *The liturgical detail is doing real work: the healing blessing's placement isn't arbitrary numbering, it is itself evidence that "healing" (which teshuvah brings) belongs to the same "eighth" register as circumcision.*

סעיף ב · 1

ב) **ויובן** זה ע"פ המבואר בהמאמר[9] דתשובה (וכפרה[10]) הם בבחינת שמיני שלמעלה מהשתלשלות. דגדולה תשובה שמביאה רפואה לעולם[11], ורפואה קבעוה בשמינית[12] דזה שרפואה קבעוה בשמינית הוא ע"ד[13] מילה שניתנה בשמינית.

And this is why, seven days before Yom Kippur, the Kohen Gadol is separated from his house,[14] and all seven days he is trained in the服务s[15] — for the seven days are the category of the chain of worlds, and Yom Kippur, the eighth day (after the seven), is above the chain of worlds.

סעיף ב · 2

וזהו ששבעה ימים קודם יום הכפורים מפרישין כהן גדול מביתו[14] וכל שבעת הימים מרגילין אותו בעבודות[15], כי שבעת הימים הם בחינת השתלשלות, ויום הכפורים, יום השמיני (שלאחרי שבעת הימים) הוא למעלה מהשתלשלות.

And this is also the significance of the eight sprinklings on Yom Kippur — one above and seven below[16] — where the "one" above the seven is the category of "one thing I have asked"[17], "one is she, My dove"[18]. *A small detail carrying the whole structure: the order of the sprinklings is one, then seven — the eighth-level "one" comes first, not last. Hold that; the next paragraph turns entirely on it.*

סעיף ב · 3

וזהו גם ענין שמונה ההזיות ביום הכפורים אחת למעלה ושבע למטה[16], שהאחת שלמעלה מהשבע היא בחינת אחת שאלתי[17], אחת היא יונתי[18].

From which it is understood that within "eighth, above the chain of worlds" there are several levels: the eighth of circumcision, and in the same way[19] the eighth of the Holy of Holies, whose entry is through the merit of circumcision; the eighth of teshuvah, which is loftier than the eighth of circumcision — since circumcision is a mitzvah, and teshuvah, which atones for what damaged Torah and mitzvos, is above Torah and mitzvos (as below, section ח).

סעיף ב · 4

ומזה מובן, דבשמיני שלמעלה מהשתלשלות כמה דרגות. שמיני דמילה ועד"ז[19] דקודש הקדשים שהכניסה לקודש הקדשים היא ע"י זכות המילה. שמיני דתשובה שנעלה יותר משמיני דמילה, (דמילה היא מצוה, ותשובה שמכפרת על הענינים שפגמו בתורה ומצוות היא למעלה מתורה ומצוות (כדלקמן סעיף ח)).

סעיף ב · 5

שמיני דיום הכפורים, שהתשובה דיום הכפורים היא נעלית יותר מהתשובה דכל השנה (גם מהתשובה דעשרת ימי תשובה[20]), שלכן יום הכפורים הוא זמן תשובה לכל[21], וביום הכפורים עצמו – שמונה ההזיות שבקודש הקדשים אחת למעלה ושבע למטה, שהאחת היא לפני השבע[22].

And the eighth of Yom Kippur — for the teshuvah of Yom Kippur is loftier than the teshuvah of the rest of the year (even than the teshuvah of the Ten Days of Repentance[20]), which is why Yom Kippur is a time of teshuvah for everyone[21] — and on Yom Kippur itself, the eight sprinklings in the Holy of Holies are one above and seven below, where the one *precedes* the seven. [22] *Three eighths now, in ascending order: circumcision's, teshuvah's, and Yom Kippur's own. The next paragraph is going to split this ladder in two, based on exactly the ordering detail just flagged.*

סעיף ב · 6

ויש לומר, דשמיני שלאחרי שבעה הוא גילוי שלמעלה מהשתלשלות שנמשך לאחרי וע"י הענינים דהשתלשלות, ומזה שהמשכת גילוי זה הוא ע"י הענינים דהשתלשלות מוכח שגילוי זה שייך להשתלשלות, ואחת שלפני השבע הוא גילוי שלמעלה מהשתלשלות שלמעלה משייכות להשתלשלות[23], [אלא שלאח"ז נמשך הגילוי בהשתלשלות, שבע שלאחרי האחת, כדלקמן סעיף ז].

And it may be said that an eighth which comes *after* seven is a revelation above the chain of worlds that is drawn after, and by means of, the matters of the chain of worlds — and from the fact that this revelation is drawn by means of the chain of worlds, it is proven that this revelation still has a relation to the chain of worlds. Whereas a "one" that comes *before* the seven is a revelation above the chain of worlds that is above any relation to the chain of worlds at all[23] — [except that afterward the revelation is drawn into the chain of worlds, the seven that follow the one, as below, section ז]. *Two structurally different "above"s. An eighth reached through seven days of preparation still has an address inside the very order it transcends — you can point to what produced it. A one that precedes the seven has no such address; it doesn't answer to the chain of worlds even as its outer edge.*

סעיף ב · 7

ועפ"ז יובן הטעם על זה שוכל אדם לא יהי' גו' הוא דוקא בבואו לכפר בקודש, כי לגבי הגילוי שהי' בקדה"ק מצד עצמו [שהוא ע"ד שמיני דמילה, שמיני שאחרי שבעה], למעלה מהשתלשלות ששייך להשתלשלות, יש נתינת מקום למציאות. וע"י העבודה דכהן גדול ביום הכפורים בקודש הקדשים נמשך הגילוי דלמעלה מהשתלשלות שלמעלה משייכות להשתלשלות, ולגבי גילוי זה כל אדם לא יהי', אפילו אותן שדמות פניהם פני אדם.

And on this basis the reason is understood for why "no one shall be there" applies specifically when he comes to atone in the Sanctuary: because with respect to the revelation that was in the Holy of Holies of itself — which follows the pattern of the eighth of circumcision, an eighth after seven — being above-the-chain-of-worlds-that-still-relates-to-the-chain-of-worlds, there is room given for created existence. But through the Kohen Gadol's service on Yom Kippur in the Holy of Holies, the revelation drawn is above-the-chain-of-worlds-that-is-above-any-relation-to-the-chain-of-worlds — and with respect to *this* revelation, no one shall be there, not even those with a human face. *Section א's question, answered: the room's own eighth is the kind with an address, so angels have standing. The service reaches the kind with no address at all.*

DEEP DIVE · THE LADDER OF EIGHTHS

Why an eighth that comes first outranks an eighth that comes after

The distinction section ב draws is easy to state and easy to underrate: both kinds of "eighth" are, by definition, above the seven-fold order of the created world. So why is one merely elevated and the other absolute?

The maamar's own test is causal, not honorific. An eighth-after-seven — circumcision on day eight, the Kohen Gadol's own entry after seven days of preparation — is drawn *by means of* the seven that precede it. You can trace a line from the preparatory work to the result. That traceability is itself the proof of a relation: whatever can be reached from the chain of worlds, by however elevated a route, still belongs to a world the chain of worlds can produce.

An eighth-before-seven has no such line. The "one" sprinkling that opens the Yom Kippur service is not the product of the seven that follow it — the seven follow *from* the one, not the other way around. There is nothing within the created order's own resources that could have gotten there, which is exactly why nothing within the created order, angels included, has standing to be present when it happens.

This is the template the rest of the maamar runs: teshuvah versus the day's own atonement (section ז) will turn out to be exactly this same distinction, restated in the language of will rather than the language of days.

SUMMARY

"Eighth" names a revelation above the created order — but there are two kinds. An eighth reached through seven days of preparation still has a causal line back into the world, and where there's a line, there's room for angels. An eighth (a "one") that precedes the seven has no such line — nothing produced it, so nothing has standing before it. The room's revelation is the first kind; the Kohen Gadol's atonement-service reaches the second.

SECTION 3

A name above the Name

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now changes register, from the calendar-structure of "eighth" to the theology of Divine names. Ordinary mitzvos are described as drawing the name Havayah into a world created through the concealing name Elokim. Teshuvah, the maamar will argue, is commanded by a name above Havayah itself — "Anochi," not "Havayah."

סעיף ג

סעיף ג · 1

ג) **ויובן** זה בהקדים מ"ש[24] כי המצוה הזאת אשר אנכי מצוך, ומבואר בלקו"ת[25] דכל המצוות נקראים מצוות הוי', והמצוה הזאת שהיא מצות התשובה, אנכי מצוך, אנכי מי שאנכי (שלמעלה מהוי').

This is understood by prefacing what is written[24]: "for this mitzvah which *Anochi* commands you" — and it is explained in Likkutei Torah[25] that all the mitzvos are called "the mitzvos of Havayah," whereas *this* mitzvah, which is the mitzvah of teshuvah, is "Anochi commands you" — Anochi, "I am that which I am," which is above the name Havayah. *One word of grammar carries the whole claim: every other mitzvah is attributed to the name Havayah; teshuvah alone is attributed to "Anochi," a name the tradition reads as pointing above even Havayah.*

סעיף ג · 2

והענין הוא[26], דענין המצוות הוא להמשיך גילוי שם הוי' בעולם. דבריאת העולם היא משם אלקים, אלקים בגימטריא הטבע[27], וע"י המצוות נמשך בעולם גילוי שם הוי' שלמעלה מהטבע. ועיקר הגילוי דהוי' שע"י קיום המצוות הוא בהאדם שמקיים את המצוות (ועי"ז נמשך הגילוי גם בעולם). וזהו שהדבור הראשון דמתן תורה הוא אנכי[28] הוי' אלקיך, שענין המצוות שניתנו במ"ת הוא שהוי' יהי' אלקיך.

And the matter is[26] that the significance of the mitzvos is to draw the revelation of the name Havayah into the world. For the creation of the world is through the name Elokim — Elokim in gematria equals *hateva*, nature[27] — and through the mitzvos, the revelation of the name Havayah, which is above nature, is drawn into the world. And the principal revelation of Havayah that comes through the fulfilment of the mitzvos is in the person who fulfils them (and through this the revelation is drawn into the world as well). And this is why the first utterance of the Giving of the Torah is "Anochi Havayah your Elokim"[28] — that the significance of the mitzvos given at Sinai is that Havayah should *be* your Elokim. *The mechanism named here — mitzvos draw Havayah into a world built on Elokim — is the baseline the rest of the section measures teshuvah against. Ordinary mitzvos work within this exchange; teshuvah, being commanded by Anochi, does not.*

סעיף ג · 3

והנה זה שע"י המצוות אפשר להמשיך בעולם גילוי שם הוי', הגם שהתהוות העולם היא ע"י שם אלקים שמעלים ומסתיר על שם הוי', הוא, לפי שכוונת ההעלם דשם אלקים (מלכתחילה) היא בכדי שע"י התומ"צ יומשך הגילוי דהוי'.

Now, that it is possible through the mitzvos to draw the revelation of the name Havayah into the world, even though the world's coming-into-being is through the name Elokim, which conceals and hides the name Havayah, is because the very intent of Elokim's concealment (from the outset) is that, through Torah and mitzvos, the revelation of Havayah be drawn. *The concealment is not an obstacle the mitzvos happen to overcome; it is built to be overcome by exactly them. That is why ordinary mitzvos suffice for it — the concealment and its remedy were designed as a matched pair.*

סעיף ג · 4

וכמ"ש[29] אשר עשה האלקים את האדם ישר, שהכוונה בההתהוות שמשם אלקים (האלקים עשה) היא שהאדם ע"י קיום המצוות ימשיך להיות ישר יחזו פנימו[30], שלמטה יהי' הגילוי כמו למעלה. וכאשר המה בקשו חשבונות רבים[31] (היפך כוונת הבריאה), הנה בכדי שיומשך הגילוי דשם הוי' באדם ועל ידו בעולם, צריכה להיות ההמשכה מאנכי שלמעלה מהוי', דהמשכה זו היא ע"י התשובה שלמעלה מהמצוות.

As it is written,[29] "which Elokim made man upright" — the intent in the coming-into-being from the name Elokim ("Elokim made") is that man, through fulfilling the mitzvos, draw uprightness, "the upright shall behold His face"[30]: that below should be revealed as it is above. And when "they have sought many calculations"[31] — the opposite of the intent of creation — then, for the revelation of the name Havayah to be drawn in man and, through him, in the world, the drawing must come from Anochi, which is above Havayah; and this drawing is through teshuvah, which is above the mitzvos. *Once a person has actually broken the design ("many calculations"), the ordinary Havayah-through-mitzvos channel is no longer enough — not because it weakened, but because it was never built to repair a breach, only to fulfil an intact design. Something from above the design itself has to reach down.*

סעיף ג · 5

וכמ"ש[32] שובה ישראל עד הוי' אלקיך כי כשלת בעוניך, שבכדי שיהי' הוי' אלקיך לאחרי שכשלת בעוניך אין מספיק קיום המצוות שמכאן ולהבא וצריך להיות שובה ישראל.

As it is written,[32] "Return, Israel, to Havayah your Elokim, for you have stumbled in your sin" — that in order for Havayah to be your Elokim *after* you have stumbled in your sin, fulfilling the mitzvos from this point forward does not suffice; there must be "return, Israel." *The verse's own grammar makes the point: it does not say "keep the mitzvos" but "return" — a different verb for a different problem. Going forward correctly cannot undo the fact that something already went wrong.*

SUMMARY

Ordinary mitzvos are commanded by Havayah and draw Havayah's revelation into a world built through the concealing name Elokim — a matched design, working exactly as intended. Once a person has actually breached that design, going forward correctly no longer reaches back to fix it; something has to be commanded by a name above Havayah itself. That is teshuvah, commanded by "Anochi."

SECTION 4

Four answers to one question

BEFORE WE READ

A classical midrash asks four tribunals — Chochmah, Nevuah, Torah, and the Holy One Himself — how a sinning soul can be atoned. Each gives a different answer, and the maamar reads the differences as tracking exactly how high each respondent's own source reaches.

The matter is understood in more detail by prefacing what our Sages said[33]: they asked Chochmah, "the soul that sins, how shall it be atoned?"[34] and it said, "the sinning soul[35] — it shall die."[36] They asked Nevuah, and it said, "evil[37] shall pursue sinners."[36] They asked the Torah, and it said, "let him bring a guilt-offering, and he shall be atoned." They asked the Holy One, and He said, "let him do teshuvah, and he shall be atoned." This is as it is written,[38] "Good and upright is Havayah; therefore He instructs sinners in the way."

סעיף ד · 1

ד) **וביאור** הענין בפרטיות יותר יובן בהקדים מה שאמרו רז"ל[33] שאלו לחכמה הנפש החוטאת במה תתכפר[34] ואמרה הנפש[35] החוטאת היא תמות[36], שאלו לנבואה ואמרה חטאים[37] תרדף רעה[36], שאלו לתורה ואמרה יביא אשם ויתכפר לו, שאלו להקב"ה ואמר יעשה תשובה ויתכפר לו. הדא הוא דכתיב[38] טוב וישר הוי' על כן יורה חטאים בדרך.

And it may be said that Chochmah's answer — that death atones the sinning soul — is because even Chochmah is above the light that clothes itself in the world. From the side of the light that clothes itself in the world, since sin is the opposite of the intent of creation, no atonement for it is possible at all; and that atonement exists at all from the side of Chochmah is because Chochmah is above the world. [Though the Chochmah meant here is *chochmah tata'ah*,[39] the Chochmah within Malchus — still, even the Chochmah within Malchus is above Malchus itself.] But from the side of Chochmah, atonement is only through death — the separation of soul from body. *Even the harshest of the four answers is not really about punishment; it's about what level can even host atonement at all. Chochmah reaches high enough that atonement becomes conceivable, but not high enough to atone without the soul first leaving the body it sinned in.*

סעיף ד · 2

ויש לומר, דזה שהחכמה אמרה שע"י מיתה תהי' כפרה לנפש החוטאת הוא לפי שגם החכמה היא למעלה מהאור שמתלבש בעולם. שמצד האור שמתלבש בעולם, מכיון שהחטא הוא היפך כוונת בריאת העולם, א"א להיות כפרה על זה, וזה שמצד החכמה ישנה כפרה לנפש החוטאת הוא כי החכמה היא למעלה מעולם. [דהגם שהכוונה בחכמה כאן היא לחכמה תתאה[39], חכמה שבמלכות, הרי גם החכמה שבמלכות היא למעלה מהמלכות עצמה]. אלא שמצד החכמה, הכפרה היא ע"י מיתה, פירוד הנפש מהגוף.

סעיף ד · 3

[ויש לומר, שהוא מדה כנגד מדה. דענין המצוות הוא להמשיך הוי' באלקים, דאלקים הוא שרש הכלים שהם דוגמת הגוף והאור דהוי' שנמשך בהם הוא דוגמת חיות הנפש שמחי' את הגוף[40]. וכיון שע"י החטאים גרם שלא יומשך הגילוי דהוי' באלקים, לכן ענשו (שעי"ז הוא כפרתו) הוא פירוד הנפש מהגוף, מדה כנגד מדה]. ומצד הנבואה שהיא בנו"ה[41] (למעלה מחכמה תתאה)[39], נפש החוטאת מתכפרת גם ע"י יסורים.

[And it may be said that this is measure for measure: the significance of the mitzvos is to draw Havayah into Elokim, for Elokim is the root of the vessels, which are like the body, and the light of Havayah drawn into them is like the vitality of the soul that gives life to the body.[40] And since through his sins he caused the revelation of Havayah in Elokim not to be drawn, therefore his punishment — which is thereby his atonement — is the separation of soul from body: measure for measure.] And from the side of Nevuah, which is in Netzach and Hod[41] (above *chochmah tata'ah*)[39], the sinning soul is atoned even through suffering. *Nevuah's answer is milder because its source sits higher — suffering, unlike death, leaves the bond between soul and body intact while still reaching the flaw.*

סעיף ד · 4

והחידוש במענה התורה ומכ"ש במענה הקב"ה, שהכפרה היא ע"י קרבן ותשובה, ואין צריך ליסורים. והחילוק שבין מענה התורה למענה הקב"ה, אף שגם מענה התורה יביא אשם ויתכפר לו הו"ע התשובה (שאז דוקא מכפר הקרבן), מבאר הצ"צ במאמר הנ"ל[42], שמצד התורה, חכמתו של הקב"ה, ע"י התשובה נעשים הזדונות (רק) כשגגות (וע"י הקרבן מתכפר שוגג זה), ומצד הקב"ה שלמעלה מתורה, ע"י התשובה מתכפרים הזדונות, ויתירה מזו, שנהפכים לזכיות.

And the novelty in the Torah's answer — and all the more so in the Holy One's own answer — is that atonement is through a sacrifice and teshuvah, with no need for suffering at all. And the difference between the Torah's answer and the Holy One's own answer — even though the Torah's answer, "let him bring a guilt offering and be atoned," is itself the matter of teshuvah (for only then does the sacrifice atone) — the Tzemach Tzedek explains in the maamar cited above[42]: from the side of Torah, the Holy One's own wisdom, through teshuvah, deliberate sins become (only) unintentional ones (and the sacrifice atones for that unintentional residue); whereas from the side of the Holy One Himself, above Torah, through teshuvah the deliberate sins are actually atoned — and more than that, they are turned into merits. *Even within "teshuvah works," there are two different strengths of working. Torah's own teshuvah downgrades a deliberate sin to an accident, which a sacrifice can then finish off. The Holy One's own teshuvah does something Torah's version cannot: it doesn't just downgrade the sin, it inverts it.*

סעיף ד · 5

וע"פ המובא לעיל (סעיף ג) דתשובה היא באור אין סוף שלמעלה מהשתלשלות, יש לומר, דהטעם על זה שגם מצד התורה מועלת תשובה (שהזדונות יהיו כשגגות), אף שתורה היא בחכמה (השתלשלות), הוא, כי בחכמה שורה אוא"ס שלמעלה מהחכמה[43], ועד"ז הוא בנוגע לתורה כמו שנמשכה בהמדות חג"ת, שהתורה היא בתפארת[44], קו האמצעי, ות"ת עולה עד הכתר.

And on the basis of what was cited above (section ג), that teshuvah is in the Infinite Light above the chain of worlds, it may be said that the reason teshuvah is also effective from the side of Torah (that deliberate sins become unintentional) — even though Torah is in Chochmah, within the chain of worlds — is that within Chochmah rests the Infinite Light, which is above Chochmah itself[43]; and likewise regarding Torah as it is drawn into the middos of Chessed-Gevurah-Tiferes, Torah being in Tiferes,[44] the middle line, and Tiferes rises all the way to Keser.

סעיף ד · 6

אלא שהאור שלמעלה מהשתלשלות שבתורה, כיון שהוא נמשך בהשתלשלות (בחכמה ובת"ת) הוא במדידה והגבלה. ולכן הכח שבתשובה מצד אוא"ס שבתורה הוא רק שיהיו כשגגות. ומענה הקב"ה הוא המשכת אוא"ס שלמעלה מהשתלשלות כמו שהוא בעצמותו (שלמעלה מהמשכה בהשתלשלות), דהמשכה זו היא למעלה ממדידה והגבלה. ולכן ע"י התשובה שמצד מענה הקב"ה מתכפרים הזדונות (ולא רק נעשים כשגגות), ויתירה מזו שנהפכים לזכיות.

Except that the above-the-chain-of-worlds light within Torah, since it is drawn *into* the chain of worlds (into Chochmah and Tiferes), is itself under measure and limit. Therefore the power in teshuvah from the side of the Infinite Light within Torah is only that sins become unintentional. Whereas the Holy One's own answer is the drawing of the Infinite Light above the chain of worlds as it is in its own Essence — above being drawn into the chain of worlds at all — and this drawing is above measure and limit entirely. Therefore, through the teshuvah that is from the side of the Holy One's own answer, deliberate sins are actually atoned (not merely downgraded), and more than that, turned into merits. *Same word, "Infinite Light," at two different addresses. Housed inside Torah, it still inherits Torah's own measure and limit — enough to soften a sin, not enough to invert it. Drawn as it is in itself, unmeasured, it can do what no housed version of it can.*

DEEP DIVE · FOUR TRIBUNALS, ONE GRADIENT

Why the answers get gentler as the source gets higher

The midrash's four answers read, on the surface, like four opinions in tension. The maamar reads them instead as four readings of the same fact from four different altitudes, and the altitude alone explains the gentleness.

Chochmah, even though it is genuinely above the light clothed in the world, only reaches high enough to make atonement *possible* — not high enough to atone without unwinding the sinner's own embodiment. Nevuah sits higher (Netzach-Hod, above *chochmah tata'ah*) and so its remedy is milder: suffering, not death — the bond of soul to body stays intact. Torah's own root reaches into the Infinite Light that rests within Chochmah, and so it can do more than either: downgrade a deliberate sin to an unintentional one. But every one of these three is *drawn into* a level of the chain of worlds, and inherits that level's own measure.

Only the Holy One's own answer — teshuvah, full stop, no sacrifice required — draws the Infinite Light as it is in Itself, never routed through any level of the chain of worlds at all. That is the one answer with no ceiling, which is exactly why it alone can convert a deliberate sin into a merit rather than merely soften its verdict.

The pattern anticipates section ד's distinction between teshuvah and the Yom Kippur day's own atonement. Both are "above the chain of worlds" in some sense; the maamar keeps drawing the same finer line — housed-in versus identical-with — because it is the line the whole discourse runs on.

SUMMARY

Four tribunals, four altitudes: Chochmah's atonement requires the soul to leave the body; Nevuah's requires only suffering; Torah's can downgrade deliberate sin to accidental; only the Holy One's own answer — teshuvah alone — can turn deliberate sin into merit, because only His answer draws the Infinite Light as it is in Itself, never housed inside any level of the created order.

SECTION 5

How the higher answer surfaces through the lower one

BEFORE WE READ

If the Holy One's own answer is categorically higher than Torah's, why does the midrash need Torah's answer said first at all — and why, when the Sages later explain why teshuvah's atonement reaches "all" rather than only the deserving, do they cite a verse about Torah, not about the deserving?

סעיף ה · 1

ה) **ויש** לומר, דזה שגם מענה הקב"ה שלמעלה מהתורה נתגלה ע"י התורה הוא, כי זה שהתורה היא בקו האמצעי הוא לפי ששרשה הוא בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מקוין, אלא שאח"כ נמשכה בקו האמצעי.

And it may be said that the reason the Holy One's own answer, which is above Torah, is nevertheless revealed *through* Torah, is that Torah's being in the middle line is because its root is in the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above all the lines — only that afterward it was drawn into the middle line. *Torah's position in the sefirotic structure is downstream of a root that sits above that structure entirely. So Torah carries, latent within its own housed position, an imprint of the unhoused root it came from.*

סעיף ה · 2

ולכן, נוסף על שיש בה האור שלמעלה מהשתלשלות כמו שנמשך בקו האמצעי (שלכן גם מצד מענה התורה מועלת תשובה שזדונות יהיו כשגגות), מתגלה על ידה גם עצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מקוין, מענה הקב"ה יעשה תשובה ויתכפר לו.

And therefore, in addition to the fact that Torah has within it the above-the-chain-of-worlds light as drawn into the middle line (which is why, even from the side of Torah's own answer, teshuvah is effective to reduce deliberate sins to unintentional ones), through Torah is also revealed the Essence of the Infinite Light which is above all the lines — the Holy One's own answer, "let him do teshuvah and be atoned."

סעיף ה · 3

היינו, דזה שאמרה תורה יביא אשם ויתכפר לו (שע"י תשובה נעשים זדונות רק כשגגות) הוא בדרגת התורה כמו שנמשכה בקו האמצעי, וזה שגם מענה הקב"ה יעשה תשובה ויתכפר לו הוא חלק בתורה (שבעל פה) הוא מצד שרש התורה בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מקוין[45].

That is: that the Torah said "let him bring a guilt offering and be atoned" (that through teshuvah deliberate sins become only unintentional) is at the level of Torah as drawn into the middle line — and that the Holy One's own answer, "let him do teshuvah and be atoned," is also a part of Torah (the Oral Torah) is from the side of Torah's root in the Essence of the Infinite Light, above all the lines.[45] *Both statements are, technically, "Torah's answer." The maamar's point is that they come from two different depths of Torah's own root — the housed depth and the unhoused depth — and the midrash's fourth answer is simply Torah speaking from the deeper one.*

סעיף ה · 4

ועפ"ז יש לבאר מה שאמרו רז"ל[46] יבוא טוב זה משה כו' ויקבל טוב זה תורה כו' מטוב זה הקב"ה דכתיב[47] טוב הוי' לכל, לטובים אלו ישראל דכתיב[48] הטיבה ה' לטובים.

And on this basis it may be explained what our Sages said[46]: "Let 'good' come" — this is Moshe — "and receive 'good'" — this is Torah — "from 'Good'" — this is the Holy One, as it is written,[47] "Havayah is good to all" — "for the good," these are Israel, as it is written,[48] "Do good, Havayah, to the good."

סעיף ה · 5

וצריך להבין, דאיתא בגמ' סנהדרין[49] כתיב[47] טוב ה' לכל וכתיב[50] טוב ה' לקוויו משל לאדם שיש לו פרדס כשהוא משקה משקה את כולו כשהוא עודר אינו עודר אלא טובים שבהם. וכיון שנתינת התורה היא (רק) לטובים אלו ישראל, הי' צריך לכאורה להביא הפסוק טוב הוי' לקוויו.

And it needs to be understood: the Gemara in Sanhedrin[49] says — it is written[47] "Havayah is good to all," and it is written[50] "Havayah is good to those who hope in Him"; a parable of a man who has an orchard — when he waters, he waters all of it, but when he weeds, he weeds only the good [trees] among them. And since the giving of the Torah was (only) to "the good," meaning Israel, it would seem the verse to bring should have been "Havayah is good to those who hope in Him." *The puzzle is precise: Torah was given to a select people, which is exactly the "weeding" case in the parable — so why does the passage justify Torah's goodness with the "watering" verse, the one about goodness reaching everyone indiscriminately?*

סעיף ה · 6

[וע"פ הידוע[51] דטוב הוי' לכל הוא השפעה חיצונית וטוב הוי' לקוויו הוא השפעה פנימית, צריך ביאור עוד יותר מה שמביא בענין נתינת התורה שהוא השפעה פנימית את הפסוק טוב הוי' לכל ולא טוב הוי' לקוויו]. ויש לומר הביאור בזה[52], דזה שבתשובה כתיב טוב וישר הוי', הכוונה היא לבחי' טוב הוי' לכל[53], שהרי תשובה מכפרת גם על הזדונות.

[And according to the known teaching[51] that "Havayah is good to all" is an external influence and "Havayah is good to those who hope in Him" is an internal influence, the difficulty is sharper still — the giving of the Torah, which is an *internal* influence, is here justified by the verse of external, indiscriminate goodness.] And it may be said that the explanation is[52]: that when teshuvah is described as "good and upright is Havayah," the reference is to the level of "Havayah is good to all,"[53] since teshuvah atones even deliberate sins. *The resolution ties directly back to section ד: teshuvah's power to atone deliberate sin — the thing that should have disqualified the sinner entirely — is itself evidence that its source is the indiscriminate "good to all," not the merit-tracking "good to those who hope."*

סעיף ה · 7

ולכן אומר ויקבל טוב זו תורה כו' מטוב זה הקב"ה דכתיב טוב הוי' לכל, כי הטוב דתורה מצד שרשה הוא בחי' טוב וישר הוי'[54], טוב הוי' לכל.

And therefore it says "and receive 'good'" — this is Torah — "from 'Good'" — this is the Holy One, as it is written "Havayah is good to all" — for the goodness of Torah, from the side of its root, is the level of "good and upright is Havayah,"[54] "Havayah is good to all." *The chain closes: Torah's deepest root is the same unhoused Essence that teshuvah draws on, so the verse describing that root correctly is the universal one, not the selective one — even though Torah's own giving, at its housed level, was selective.*

SUMMARY

Torah occupies the middle line, but its own root sits above all the lines — which is why Torah can voice the Holy One's own, unhoused answer ("let him do teshuvah") and not only its own housed one ("let him bring an offering"). The same structure explains a separate difficulty: Torah's goodness is described with the universal verse, not the selective one, because at the level of its root, Torah is exactly that universal, unmeasured "good to all" that teshuvah itself draws from.

SECTION 6

Tov, not chesed

BEFORE WE READ

A short section, but the hinge of the whole maamar's account of *why* teshuvah can reach where merit cannot: a technical distinction between two Divine attributes that both sound like generosity — חסד and טוב — but are not the same kind of giving.

סעיף ו

Now, although the fact that teshuvah atones is because the response drawn through teshuvah is from above the chain of worlds, the atonement effected through teshuvah is (not in the manner of a waiver, in which the sins are simply forgiven, but rather) an inner action within the person who returns, by which his flaws are actually repaired. And this is "good and upright is Havayah; therefore He instructs sinners in the way" — for *tov*, "good," is that which gives to all. *This is a real distinction, not a rhetorical flourish. "Atonement" could in principle mean the charge is simply dropped. The maamar insists it means something happened inside the sinner — an actual repair, not a pardon.*

סעיף ו · 1

ו) **והנה** הגם דזה שתשובה מכפרת הוא לפי שהמענה שע"י התשובה הוא מלמעלה מהשתלשלות, הכפרה שע"י תשובה היא (לא באופן של ויתור, שמוותרים על החטאים, אלא) פעולה פנימית בהאדם השב, שמתתקנים הפגמים שלו. וזהו טוב וישר הוי' על כן יורה חטאים בדרך, דטוב הוא שמשפיע לכל.

And as explained elsewhere[55], the difference between *tov* and *chesed*: chesed pertains to the recipient, and therefore the influence of chesed is specifically to one who is worthy [though the attribute of chesed itself is not exacting — once the recipient has any merit at all, he is already worthy of receiving] — whereas *tov* is from the side of the giver, and therefore its influence is to everyone (even to those unworthy). And *yashar*, "upright," is that what is below is like what is above[56]. *The distinction: chesed still asks a question of the recipient, however lightly. Tov asks nothing — it is defined entirely by the giver's own nature, which is why it can reach someone with no merit to point to at all.*

סעיף ו · 2

וכמבואר במק"א[55] החילוק בין טוב לחסד, דחסד שייך להמקבל ולכן השפעת החסד היא דוקא למי שראוי [אלא שמצד מדת החסד אינו מדקדק, וכשיש להמקבל איזו מעלה הוא כבר ראוי שישפיעו לו], וטוב הוא מצד המשפיע ולכן ההשפעה היא לכולם (גם לשאינם ראויים). וישר הוא שלמטה הוא כמו למעלה[56].

And this is why the drawing through teshuvah is from the level of *tov v'yashar*: that teshuvah atones deliberate sins is not because the person is worthy of it, but because of the Holy One's own *tov* — the drawing of the Infinite Light above the chain of worlds. And that through this drawing his flaws are actually repaired, and the repair is internal, is because the drawing of the *tov* comes *in the manner of chesed* — the person who returns being, as it were, a vessel for the drawing. *A careful last move: the atonement's source is tov — unearned, addressed to no merit. But its landing in the person takes the form of chesed — it actually enters him as a vessel, which is why it repairs rather than merely excuses.*

סעיף ו · 3

וזהו שההמשכה שע"י התשובה היא מבחינת טוב וישר, דזה שתשובה מכפרת על הזדונות הוא לא מפני שהאדם ראוי לזה אלא מפני הטוב דהקב"ה, המשכת אוא"ס שלמעלה מהשתלשלות. וזה שע"י המשכה זו מתתקנים הפגמים שלו, והתיקון הוא בפנימיות, הוא לפי שהמשכת הטוב היא באופן דחסד, שהאדם השב הוא כמו כלי להההמשכה.

IN AVODAH

This is not permission to sin casually, and the maamar does not read that way — but it is permission to stop treating teshuvah as a negotiation for which one must first become deserving. The entire mechanism described here works precisely because it does not ask whether you have earned it. What it does ask is whether you will be a vessel for what it draws — whether the return is real enough that something actually lands and repairs, not just a debt marked settled.

SUMMARY

Teshuvah's atonement repairs, it does not merely excuse — and it can do this for the undeserving precisely because its source is *tov* (which gives regardless of merit) rather than *chesed* (which still answers to merit, however lightly). The repair lands internally because, in its landing, this same "good" takes the form of chesed — the returning person serving as its vessel.

SECTION 7

Beyond the Willer of the will

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar's hardest move. Teshuvah, already shown to reach further than any mitzvah, is now itself outranked — by the atonement of the day of Yom Kippur itself, independent of teshuvah. The distinction is between a flaw against the *will* and a level where the very category of flaw never applied.

סעיף ז

Now, that through teshuvah deliberate sins are atoned, and even turned into merits, holds true throughout the year, and all the more so during the Ten Days of Repentance, when teshuvah is loftier still[57]. And the special virtue of Yom Kippur's teshuvah is that Yom Kippur's atonement is from the side of "the essence of the day"[58] — and *this* atonement is loftier still than the atonement that comes through teshuvah. *A third tier is opening up: ordinary teshuvah, teshuvah during the Ten Days, and now something that isn't teshuvah's own action at all — the day's own atoning power, which the maamar is about to distinguish sharply from everything said so far.*

סעיף ז · 1

ז) **והנה** זה שע"י תשובה מתכפרים הזדונות ועד שנהפכים לזכיות הוא גם בכל השנה. ועאכו"כ בעשרת ימי תשובה, שאז התשובה היא נעלית יותר[57]. ומעלת התשובה דיום הכפורים היא שהכפרה דיום הכפורים היא מצד עיצומו של יום[58], שכפרה זו היא נעלית יותר מהכפרה שע"י התשובה.

And that Yom Kippur atones only for those who return is because the drawing of "the essence of the day" to the person is through teshuvah. And the matter is[59]: that through teshuvah the matters done against the will are atoned is because through teshuvah is drawn, from the Essence of the Infinite Light, *the Owner of the will Who is not compelled by the will*. *A crucial qualifier: the day's own power still needs teshuvah as its delivery mechanism to reach a person. What changes is not the mechanism but the source being delivered — not the will itself, but the One who has a will without being confined to it.*

סעיף ז · 2

וזה שיום הכפורים אין מכפר אלא לשבים הוא, שהמשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום להאדם היא ע"י התשובה. והענין הוא[59], דזה שע"י התשובה מתכפרים הענינים שעשו היפך הרצון הוא לפי שע"י התשובה נמשך מעצמות אוא"ס בעל הרצון שאינו מוכרח בהרצון.

That the Owner of the will is not compelled by the will is the matter of the *hafla'ah* — the wondrousness — of the Infinite Light, and not the very Essence of the Infinite Light itself[60]. And since the significance of the "Owner of the will's" wondrousness is that *He* is wondrous relative to the will, this itself proves that the will has some relation to Him [as is also proven by His being called "Owner of the will" at all] — and therefore there must be forgiveness and atonement for having acted against the will. *Follow the logic precisely: to be called the will's "Owner" already implies a relation to the will, even a transcendent one. And wherever there is a relation, a breach against it is a real breach — which is exactly why this level, unlike the next one, still needs forgiveness at all.*

סעיף ז · 3

דזה שבעל הרצון אינו מוכרח בהרצון הו"ע ההפלאה דאוא"ס ולא עצמות אוא"ס ממש[60]. וכיון שענין ההפלאה דבעל הרצון הוא שהוא מופלא מהרצון, הרי זה מוכיח שיש להרצון שייכות אליו [וכדמוכח גם מזה שנקרא בשם בעל הרצון], לכן צריכה להיות סליחה וכפרה על זה שעשו היפך הרצון.

סעיף ז · 4

משא"כ לגבי עצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה גם מבעל הרצון, אין שייך פגם מלכתחילה. וזהו"ע עיצומו של יום מכפר, שהכפרה מצד עיצומו של יום היא (לא באופן של פעולה, אלא) שביום זה מתגלה ההתקשרות של עצם הנשמה עם העצמות (שלמעלה מבעל הרצון), שלגבי דרגא זו אין פגם מלכתחילה.

Whereas with respect to the very Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above even the Owner of the will, no flaw applies to begin with. And this is the matter of "the essence of the day atones": that the atonement from the side of the essence of the day is (not in the manner of an action at all, but rather) that on this day is revealed the bond between the essence of the soul and the Essence — which is above the Owner of the will — a level with respect to which no flaw ever applied in the first place. *This is the section's real center, and it is a denial, not a description. The day's atonement isn't a stronger fix for the same kind of breach; it works at a level where "breach" was never a coherent category — the essential bond was never in a relation to the will at all, so it was never exposed to being broken.*

סעיף ז · 5

והטעם שהמשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום היא ע"י התשובה, הוא, כי תיקון הפגמים ע"י הגילוי דעצם הנשמה (שמצד עצם הנשמה אין שייך פגם מלכתחילה), אין שייך (כ"כ) לענינם של כחות הגלויים עצמם[61], ובכדי שהכפרה שע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה תהי' בפנימיות, הוא ע"י התשובה.

And the reason the drawing of "the essence of the day" to the person is through teshuvah is that the repair of flaws through the revelation of the soul's essence (with respect to which no flaw ever applied to begin with) does not (so) pertain to the matter of the revealed powers themselves[61] — and in order for the atonement through the revelation of the soul's essence to be internalized, this is through teshuvah. *Section ו's finding returns here in a new key: the essence-level revelation, by itself, has no natural point of contact with the person's actual, revealed faculties — the ones that did the sinning. Teshuvah is what lets that contact happen, the same way it was the vessel for tov's landing in section ו.*

סעיף ז · 6

[**ויש** להוסיף, שהמשכת הכפרה דעיצומו של יום בכחות הגלויים ע"י התשובה, כיון שענין התשובה הוא שהאדם יוצא מההגבלות שלו, לכן ההמשכה שע"י התשובה היא בהכחות כמו שהם בתנועה דהעלאה. ובכדי שהכפרה דעיצומו של יום תומשך גם בכחות הגלויים כמו שהם בהציור שלהם, הוא ע"י מצות התשובה, דביום הכפורים חייבים הכל לעשות תשובה[62]. ולהעיר, דג' ענינים אלה שביום הכפורים הם דוגמת ג' הענינים שבתק"ש. המצוה דתק"ש, ענין התשובה המרומז בתק"ש, והביטול פנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה[63]].

[And it may be added: the drawing of the atonement of "the essence of the day" into the revealed powers through teshuvah — since the matter of teshuvah is that the person goes out of his own limits, the drawing through teshuvah is into the powers as they are in a movement of ascent. And in order for the atonement of "the essence of the day" to be drawn even into the revealed powers as they are in their own fixed form, this comes through the *mitzvah* of teshuvah — for on Yom Kippur, everyone is obligated to do teshuvah[62]. And it should be noted that these three matters of Yom Kippur parallel the three matters of the sounding of the shofar: the mitzvah of the shofar, the matter of teshuvah alluded to in the shofar, and the inner self-nullification from the essence of the soul.[63]] *The cross-reference is deliberate: the sibling maamar (יבחר לנו, section י) mapped the same three-tier structure onto the shofar. Here it is the same three tiers, mapped onto Yom Kippur — the day this maamar's own hemshech leads into next.*

סעיף ז · 7

ויש לומר, שזהו"ע שמונה ההזיות שהיו בקודש הקדשים, אחת למעלה ושבע למטה, אחת למעלה היא גילוי היחידה[64], שהיא מיוחדת עם העצמות, ושבע למטה (שלאחרי האחת) הוא שגילוי היחידה (למעלה מהשתלשלות שבאדם) יומשך בכחות הגלויים, השתלשלות שבאדם[65].

And it may be said that this is the significance of the eight sprinklings that were in the Holy of Holies, one above and seven below: the "one" above is the revelation of the *yechidah*[64], which is united with the Essence, and the seven below (which follow the one) are that the revelation of the *yechidah* (above the chain of worlds within man) should be drawn into the revealed powers — the chain of worlds within man[65]. *Section ב's ordering puzzle is now solved: the "one" precedes the seven because the essence-revelation always precedes its own drawing-down into the ordinary faculties — you cannot draw a light into the powers before the light itself is present.*

DEEP DIVE · A FLAW THAT WAS NEVER POSSIBLE

Why "beyond the will" outranks "against the will"

Section ז's claim can sound like hair-splitting until its actual logical shape is seen clearly. It is not saying the day's atonement is a *stronger version* of teshuvah's atonement. It is saying the day's atonement is not atonement for a flaw at all, in the sense that word has carried through the whole maamar so far.

Every prior level — Chochmah's, Nevuah's, Torah's, even the Holy One's own answer of teshuvah — operates against a real breach: something was done against the will, and the will (even the "Owner of the will," precisely because He is called that) stands in enough relation to the deed that a breach against it is coherent, and so repairable. "Owner of the will" is itself a relational title; a relation is exactly the kind of thing that can be violated.

The essence of the soul's bond with the Essence carries no such relation to begin with — not because it is unusually resistant to sin, but because it was never in the kind of connection to the will where "against the will" could apply to it. Nothing there was ever exposed. This is why the maamar insists the day's atonement is "not in the manner of an action" — there is no damage to repair, only a bond to reveal.

The practical stakes are immediate: teshuvah is still required, not because the essence-bond needs it, but because a person's ordinary, revealed faculties do — they need a vessel to receive what the essence-revelation draws, and teshuvah is that vessel, exactly as tov needed chesed as its vessel in section ו.

IN AVODAH

There is a real comfort available here that is easy to state wrong. It is not "nothing you did really counts." It is that beneath every level at which something did go wrong — and those levels are real, and teshuvah genuinely has to answer for them — there is a level that was never implicated, because it was never the kind of thing that could be. Yom Kippur does not ask you to locate that level yourself. It asks for teshuvah, and lets the day do what teshuvah alone cannot.

SUMMARY

Teshuvah atones for acting against the will, because even the "Owner of the will" stands in enough relation to the will that a breach against it is real and repairable. The day of Yom Kippur's own atonement reaches further: the essence of the soul's bond with the Essence was never in that relation at all, so no flaw ever applied there to begin with — there is nothing to repair, only a bond to reveal. Teshuvah remains necessary as the vessel that lets this revelation land in the person's ordinary, revealed faculties.

SECTION 8

Ranking the three eighths

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now closes the loop opened in section ב, ranking the three "eighths" by how new the light each one draws actually is — and the ranking runs through a question about intention: was this light always meant to appear, or does its appearance answer something that was never supposed to happen?

And on this basis the difference between the three matters of "eighth" may be explained — the eighth of circumcision, the eighth of teshuvah, and the eighth of Yom Kippur. Circumcision is a mitzvah, and since the very intent of creation from the outset is that Israel fulfil all the mitzvos and draw the revelations that come through them, the revelations drawn through the mitzvos (circumcision included) are not truly a *new* light[66] — since the original intent of creation was precisely that Israel draw these revelations. *"Not truly new" is a technical claim, not a diminishment: circumcision's revelation, however exalted, was always on the design's own blueprint. Drawing it fulfils the plan; it doesn't answer anything that went wrong.*

סעיף ח · 1

ח) **ועפ"ז** יש לבאר החילוק שבין ג' הענינים דשמיני, שמיני דמילה ושמיני דתשובה ושמיני דיום הכפורים, דמילה היא מצוה, וכיון שכוונת הבריאה מלכתחילה היא שישראל יקיימו את כל המצוות וימשיכו הגילויים שנמשכים על ידם, לכן הגילויים שנמשכים ע"י המצוות (כולל גם מצות מילה) אינם אור חדש ממש[66], מכיון שכוונת הבריאה מלכתחילה היא שישראל ימשיכו גילויים אלו.

And even though the revelation drawn through all the other mitzvos is the revelation of Havayah, while the revelation drawn through circumcision is above Havayah — as explained in Torah Or[67], that "who shall go up for us to heaven"[68] has as its first letters *mem-lamed* [circumcision] and last letters *hei-vav-yud* [Havayah][69], indicating that circumcision is above Havayah — nevertheless, since the creation of the worlds from the outset was so that this light would be drawn through the mitzvah of circumcision, it is a light that has a relation to the worlds.

סעיף ח · 2

ואף שהגילוי שנמשך ע"י כל המצוות הוא הגילוי דהוי' והגילוי שנמשך ע"י המילה הוא למעלה מהוי', וכמבואר בתו"א[67] דמי יעלה לנו השמימה[68] הוא ר"ת מילה וס"ת הוי'[69] שזה מורה שמילה היא למעלה מהוי', מ"מ, כיון שבריאת העולמות מלכתחילה היא שע"י מצות מילה ימשיכו אור זה, הוא אור שיש לו שייכות לעולמות.

[And it may be said that, in general terms, even this light is included within Havayah. For within "Havayah," in the sense of "that which brings into being,"[70] there are two levels: the source from which the world's coming-into-being occurs, and the *will* to bring the world into being[71]. And since the will to bring-into-being includes that the revelation through circumcision also be drawn, this revelation too is included within Havayah. And that the revelation through circumcision is above Havayah means only that it is above the *source* of coming-into-being, not above the will itself.] *A fine but real distinction, echoing section ז's Owner-of-the-will move: circumcision's light is "above Havayah" only relative to Havayah's mechanical source, never relative to the will that intended it. It is exalted, but it was never outside the plan.*

סעיף ח · 3

[ויש לומר, שבכללות, גם אור זה נכלל בהוי'. כי בהוי' לשון מהווה[70] שתי דרגות. המקור שממנו נעשה התהוות העולם, והרצון להוות את העולם[71]. וכיון שהרצון להוות הוא שיומשך גם הגילוי שע"י המילה, הרי גילוי זה נכלל בהוי'. וזה שהגילוי שע"י המילה הוא למעלה מהוי' הוא שגילוי זה הוא למעלה ממקור ההתהוות].

Whereas the eighth of teshuvah is the revelation of a genuinely new light. For through having sinned and flawed and departed from the way (the opposite of the intent in man's creation, which was that "Elokim made man upright"), and afterward repairing this through teshuvah — through this a new light is drawn that was not (so to speak) even within the original intent of creation. Except that this light is from the "Owner of the will," which does have a relation to the will and the intent of creation. *Teshuvah's light is new precisely because it answers something the blueprint never called for — a breach. But it is drawn from a source (the Owner of the will) that, per section ז, still stands in relation to the will, hence still repairable, hence still "new" rather than beyond category.*

סעיף ח · 4

ושמיני דתשובה הוא גילוי אור חדש. דע"י שחטא ופגם והעביר את הדרך (היפך הכוונה דבריאת האדם שהי' באופן דעשה האלקים את האדם ישר) ואח"כ מתקן זה ע"י התשובה, עי"ז נמשך אור חדש שלא הי' (כביכול) גם בכוונת הבריאה. אלא שאור זה הוא מבעל הרצון, שיש לו שייכות להרצון והכוונה דהבריאה.

And the eighth of Yom Kippur, whose atonement is "the essence of the day," is the revelation of the very Essence of the Infinite Light, above even the Owner of the will. Except that the revelation of this matter is principally at the time the Kohen Gadol enters the Holy of Holies. And therefore the eighth of Yom Kippur, too, is an eighth that follows the seven days preceding Yom Kippur — for, in general terms, even the eighth of Yom Kippur (as the day of the calendar) is above-the-chain-of-worlds-that-relates-to-the-chain-of-worlds (the Owner of the will); whereas the order in the eight sprinklings within the Holy of Holies is that the one *precedes* the seven. *A careful reconciliation of section ב's two-kind ladder with section ח's three-kind ranking: Yom Kippur the calendar day is still an eighth-after-seven, like circumcision. It is specifically the sprinklings within the day's own service that reach the higher, eighth-before-seven register. The day is the occasion; the service inside it is where the deepest level actually surfaces.*

סעיף ח · 5

ושמיני דיום הכפורים, שעיצומו של יום מכפר, הוא גילוי עצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה גם מבעל הרצון. אלא שגילוי ענין זה הוא בעיקר בעת כניסת הכה"ג לקודש הקדשים. ולכן, גם השמיני דיום הכפורים הוא שמיני שלאחרי שבעת הימים שלפני יום הכפורים, כי בכללות, גם השמיני דיום הכפורים הוא למעלה מהשתלשלות ששייך להשתלשלות (בעל הרצון), משא"כ הסדר בשמונה ההזיות שבקודש הקדשים, הוא שהאחת היא לפני השבעה.

DEEP DIVE

Old light, new light, no-flaw light

The three eighths, once ranked, turn out to track a single question: was this revelation always intended, and if not, what kind of "not intended" is it?

Circumcision's light was always on the blueprint — drawing it is fulfilment, not repair, however exalted the light itself is. Teshuvah's light is genuinely new: it answers a breach the blueprint never called for, and its source (the Owner of the will) is still in relation to that blueprint, which is exactly why the breach was repairable by it. Yom Kippur's own atonement is newer again, because its source — the Essence above even the Owner of the will — was never in relation to any blueprint, breach, or plan at all. Nothing there needed a plan to account for it, and nothing there could have been left off one.

The calendar detail in the final line is not a stray technicality. It resolves an apparent inconsistency: is Yom Kippur an eighth-after-seven (like circumcision) or an eighth-before-seven (the deepest kind)? Both, depending on what inside Yom Kippur is being discussed — the day as a date is the former; the sprinkling-order within the day's own service, where the essence actually surfaces, is the latter.

SUMMARY

Circumcision draws a light the blueprint of creation always intended — exalted, but not new. Teshuvah draws a genuinely new light, answering a breach the blueprint never called for, from a source (the Owner of the will) still in relation to that blueprint. Yom Kippur's own atonement draws from the Essence above even the Owner of the will — a level in relation to no blueprint at all, which is why, within the day's own service, its order is "one before seven," not "eighth after seven."

SECTION 9

The answer

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar returns to its opening verse and states the answer directly, then closes with two further reaches of the same idea: the prayer of Ne'ilah, and a Zoharic reading of Yosef's self-revelation to his brothers that ties this whole discourse forward into Shemini Atzeres — the occasion of the next maamar in the series.

סעיף ט

And this is "no one shall be in the Ohel Moed when he comes to atone in the Sanctuary": that "no one shall be there… even those whose faces have the likeness of a human face" applies specifically when the Kohen Gadol comes, in the Holy of Holies, to atone — for the above-the-chain-of-worlds revelation that was in the Holy of Holies of itself still has a relation to the chain of worlds, and with respect to that revelation there is room for angels.

סעיף ט · 1

ט) **וזהו** וכל אדם לא יהי' באוהל מועד בבואו לכפר בקודש, דזה שכל אדם לא יהי' גו' אפילו אותן שדמות פניהם פני אדם הוא דוקא בבואו של הכה"ג בקודש הקדשים לכפר בקודש, כי הגילוי דלמעלה מהשתלשלות שהי' בקודש הקדשים מצד עצמו, יש לו שייכות להשתלשלות, ולגבי גילוי זה יש מקום למלאכים.

But when he comes to atone in the Sanctuary — that through the Kohen Gadol's service in the Holy of Holies, atonement is drawn for all of Israel — this is because through his service is revealed the bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence; and in the Essence of the Infinite Light there is no room given for angels at all — "Israel and the King alone"[72] — and therefore, at that moment, no one shall be there, not even those whose faces have the likeness of a human face. *The opening question is now fully answered: the room's revelation permits angels because it still has an address in the chain of worlds; the service reaches the essence-bond with the Essence, which has no such address, and so no created being — angel included — has standing there.*

סעיף ט · 2

אבל בבואו (של הכה"ג לקודש הקדשים) לכפר בקודש, דזה שע"י עבודתו של הכה"ג בקודש הקדשים נמשכה כפרה לכל ישראל הוא לפי שע"י עבודתו מתגלה ההתקשרות דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, דבעצמות אוא"ס אין שום נתינת מקום למלאכים, ישראל ומלכא בלחודוהי[72], לכן אז כל אדם לא יהי' אפילו אותן שדמות פניהם פני אדם.

סעיף ט · 3

ולהוסיף[73], שבתפלת נעילה מאיר גילוי זה עוד יותר מאשר במוסף דיום הכפורים שבה אומרים סדר העבודה דכהן גדול ביום הכפורים. כי החמשה תפלות דיום הכפורים הם כנגד חמשה דרגות שבנשמה, נפש רוח נשמה חי' ויחידה. דג' תפלות הראשונות הם בנר"נ, ותפלת מוסף דיום הכפורים היא בחי' [†], והגילוי דיחידה הוא (בעיקר) בתפלת נעילה.

And it may be added[73] that in the Ne'ilah prayer this revelation shines even more than in the Mussaf of Yom Kippur, in which the order of the Kohen Gadol's service is recited. For the five prayers of Yom Kippur correspond to the five levels of the soul — nefesh, ruach, neshamah, chayah, and yechidah. The first three prayers are in nefesh-ruach-neshamah, the Mussaf prayer of Yom Kippur is the level of *chayah*[†], and the revelation of yechidah is (principally) in the Ne'ilah prayer. [†] *The live-rendered source text reads "is the level of..." and stops before naming the level, almost certainly a rendering artifact dropping a repeated word — see `hebrew-source.md`. "Chayah" is the natural fourth term in the five-level enumeration two sentences earlier (nefesh–ruach–neshamah–chayah–yechidah) and is supplied here as the evident reading, not verified against a second source or photograph. Mussaf, where the service itself is recited, would then reach chayah; Ne'ilah, where nothing is recited but the day itself is closing, reaches the yechidah — one register higher than even the described service.*

סעיף ט · 4

ולכן נקראת בשם נעילה, כי אז ננעלים כל השערים וגם נבראים הכי עליונים (ואפילו נאצלים וכו') אין יכולים ליכנס, ישראל ומלכא בלחודוהי.

And this is why it is called *Ne'ilah*, "closing" — for then all the gates close, and even the loftiest creatures (even the *Atzilus*-level beings) cannot enter — "Israel and the King alone."

סעיף ט · 5

וזהו גם מ"ש בזהר[74] עה"פ[75] ולא עמד איש אתו בהתוודע יוסף אל אחיו, בזמנא דקוב"ה הוה מתחבר בהו ישראל כו' בגין כך ביום[76] השמיני עצרת תהי' לכם, דיש לומר שענין קוב"ה מתחבר בהו בישראל הוא גילוי היחידה וההתקשרות העצמית דהעצמות עם עצם הנשמה.

And this is also what is written in the Zohar[74], on the verse[75] "and no one stood with him when Yosef made himself known to his brothers" — at the time the Holy One would attach Himself to Israel… therefore, on the eighth day, Shemini Atzeres, it shall be for you[76] — where it may be said that the Holy One's "attaching Himself" to Israel is the revelation of the yechidah, the essential bond of the Essence with the essence of the soul. *The Zohar's own parallel is exact: Yosef's disclosure to his brothers happens with no one else present, structurally identical to the Kohen Gadol's entry — a self-revelation that by its nature excludes any third party, angel or otherwise.*

סעיף ט · 6

[ויש לומר שהשייכות דענין זה ליוסף, דשם יוסף הוא על שם יוסף הוי' לי בן אחר[77], שגם אחר נעשה בן[78], כי ע"י גילוי התקשרות העצמית דהעצמות בישראל (בהתוודע יוסף אל אחיו) מתגלה שגם אחר הוא בן]. וגילוי זה הוא בשמיני עצרת, וכידוע שבשמיני עצרת ישנם כל הענינים שבראש השנה ויום הכפורים, אלא שבשמיני עצרת הם בקו השמחה, ולכן ביום השמיני עצרת תהי' לכם, יהיו[79] לך לבדך ואין לזרים אתך.

[And it may be said that the connection of this matter to Yosef specifically is that the name Yosef is from "may Havayah *add* to me another son"[77] — that even "another" becomes a son[78] — for through the revelation of the Essence's own bond with Israel ("Yosef made himself known to his brothers") it is revealed that even "another" is a son.] And this revelation is on Shemini Atzeres — and as is known, on Shemini Atzeres all the matters of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur are present, except that on Shemini Atzeres they are in the register of joy. And this is why, on the eighth day, Shemini Atzeres, "it shall be for you" — "for you alone, and not for others with you."[79] *The maamar's final word points forward, not just back: everything built here — the eighth, the essence-bond, the exclusion of every "other" — recurs on Shemini Atzeres in the register of joy rather than judgment. That is exactly where the hemshech's next maamar, תורה צוה, picks up.*

IN AVODAH

The maamar's arc, start to finish, is a single motion from "no room for anyone" to "for you alone" — the same exclusion read first as awe and finally as intimacy. Ne'ilah's closing gates are not a door shutting a person out; they are a door shutting everyone *else* out, so that what is left in the room is only the bond itself. The work of the Ten Days and Yom Kippur is not to become impressive enough to survive that closing door. It is to have returned enough that when the door closes, what is found already there is exactly this.

SUMMARY

The room's own revelation still relates to the chain of worlds, so angels may stand there; the Kohen Gadol's atonement-service reaches the bond between the soul's essence and the Essence, which has no such relation, so no created being — angel included — has room there. Ne'ilah reveals this more than Mussaf, because it reaches the yechidah rather than the chayah. And the same essential bond, per the Zohar, is what "Yosef made himself known… no one stood with him" describes — carrying the maamar's entire structure forward into Shemini Atzeres, "for you alone."

בסוכות תשבו

ד"ה בסוכות תשבו שבעת ימים · יום ב' דחג הסוכות ה'תשכ"ג · מוגה

In Sukkos Shall You Dwell

> *A sukkah is built from encompassing light — the kind that, by definition, never settles into anything.*

The argument at a glance

Eight moves: two verses give two different reasons for sitting in a sukkah. The maamar reads the gap between them as the gap between the near encompassing light and the far one — and asks how a week of sitting could touch either.

TWO VERSES	א	"In sukkos shall you dwell" is a command to act; "I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos" is a report of what God already did. The Rebbe's father-in-law reads the second as the reason for the first — but if God already housed Israel in the Creator's own bosom, why does anything need to be commanded at all?
NEAR AND FAR	ב	Two encompassing lights, two verses: "dwell" reaches the near encompassing light; "I made dwell" names the far one — the level of the essence of the soul itself, rooted in the Essence, where there is nothing left to command.
THE REAL PUZZLE	ג	Encompassing light, by its own definition, cannot settle — that is what makes it encompassing rather than internalized. So how can a week of sitting in a sukkah change the near encompassing light into something settled at all?
THE ANSWER	ד	Only relative to itself is encompassing light unsettleable. Relative to the Essence, where near and far, encompassing and internal, are not even distinct categories, even encompassing light can be settled — and sitting in the sukkah draws exactly that level.
A NEW SELF	ה	Why can a week of sitting draw the Essence at all? Because teshuvah itself works this way: it does not repair the old self, it makes the person a new being entirely — and only from a root that never was implicated to begin with.
FROM THE DEPTHS	ו	Cross-referencing the shofar maamar's revealed/concealed/absolute will: the Ten Days' own "Mi'maamakim" — "out of the depths" — draws not from the accessible depth of the heart but from the depth before all depths, the root of the root.
DEEPER STILL	ז	Yom Kippur's own avodah reaches deeper than the Ten Days' own — because Yom Kippur's atonement is from the essence of the soul as it stands above any relation to the revealed faculties at all, not merely deeper within them.
CLOSING THE LOOP	ח	Sukkos is the revelation of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah made settled: the near encompassing light becomes a settled light because it is drawn by an arousal from Above no different in kind from what makes the absolute will itself responsive — and the far encompassing light was never subject to change to begin with, only revealed.

SECTION 1

Two verses, two reasons

BEFORE WE READ

The Torah gives the mitzvah of the sukkah twice in the same breath: a command ("in sukkos shall you dwell") and, in the next clause, a reason cast as a report ("for I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos when I took them out of Egypt"). The Frierdiker Rebbe's own maamar on this verse (the base text this discourse builds from) reads the two clauses as naming two different actors — God's own act of housing Israel, and Israel's own commanded act of dwelling — and the maamar opens by pressing on why the commanded act needs its own reason at all.

סעיף א

סעיף א · 1

"In sukkos shall you dwell seven days; every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos, so that your generations may know that I made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos when I took them out of the land of Egypt."[1] **And my father-in-law the Rebbe, in his own maamar on this verse (in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703)**[2]**, notes precisely: that "I made [them] dwell in sukkos" is that the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell — to Israel; while "in sukkos shall you dwell" is a command to Israel that they themselves dwell in sukkos — that is, that they dwell by their own power, in their very being. And nevertheless the Rebbe states a reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell": that since the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell in sukkos by His own power, they are therefore able, and required, to dwell in sukkos by their own power.** *The grammar carries the whole distinction: one clause is God's own deed done to Israel, the other is Israel's own commanded deed. The puzzle the Rebbe is about to press on is why an act that is Israel's own, commanded of them, needs God's prior deed as its stated reason at all.*

בסוכות תשבו שבעת ימים כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות למען ידעו דורותיכם כי בסוכות הושבתי את בני ישראל בהוציאי אותם מארץ מצרים[1], ומדייק כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר במאמרו ד"ה זה (שבהמשך ר"ה תש"ג)[2], דבסוכות הושבתי הוא שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל לישראל, ובסוכות תשבו הוא ציווי לישראל שהם ישבו בסוכות, היינו שישבו בכח בסוכות בעצם, ואעפ"כ אומר כ"ק אדמו"ר טעם על זה דבסוכות תשבו, דכיון שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל בסוכות בכח עצם, לכן יכולים הם וצריכים לשבת בסוכות בכח עצם.

סעיף א · 2

And it may be said that the Rebbe's precise reading carries two points: since "I made [them] dwell" is a matter that is [entirely] in the Creator's own bosom, they are therefore able, and required, to sit in sukkos by their own power. And also, from the very fact that a reason is given at all for "in sukkos shall you dwell" — namely, "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" — it is proven that Israel's ability to sit in sukkos is not by their own power, but through a power given from Above; and nevertheless, once the Holy One made the children of Israel dwell (when He took them out of Egypt), they are thereafter able to sit in the sukkah by their own power. *Both points cut the same way: the commanded act ("you shall dwell") turns out to depend entirely on the reported act ("I made dwell") for its very possibility — not just its justification. The rest of the maamar is the explanation of how a past divine act becomes a present human capacity.*

ויש לומר, שבהדיוק שבהמאמר שני ענינים[3]. דכיון שבסוכות הושבתי הוא בחיק הבורא [ענין שהוא רק בחיק הבורא] לכן הם יכולים וצריכים לשבת בסוכות בכח עצם. וגם, מזה שאומר טעם על זה דבסוכות תשבו (כי בסוכות הושבתי) מוכח שבכדי שיוכלו ישראל לישב בסוכות הוא לא בכח עצמם אלא ע"י נתינת כח מלמעלה, ואעפ"כ, לאחרי שהקב"ה הושיב את בני ישראל (כשהוציאם מארץ מצרים) יכולים הם לישב בסוכה בכח עצמם.

SUMMARY

The sukkah's two verses name two different actors: God's own housing of Israel "in His bosom," and Israel's own commanded dwelling. The command depends entirely on the deed — not merely as its justification, but as the source of the very power to fulfil it. The maamar's task is to explain how a divine act completed at the Exodus becomes something a person can do himself, every year, by his own power.

SECTION 2

Near and far

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now supplies the structural key for the whole discourse: two kinds of encompassing light (מקיף), near and far, keyed respectively to the two verses. This vocabulary — a light that surrounds a person rather than entering him, and which comes in nearer and farther grades — recurs throughout Chassidus; here it is mapped directly onto the sukkah's own two clauses.

סעיף ב

Now, even within Israel's own sitting in sukkos by their own power, there are two matters: "in sukkos shall you dwell," and "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos." And among the differences between these two matters: "in sukkos shall you dwell" is phrased as a command, while "shall dwell in sukkos" is phrased as narration and report. And a further difference: the command "in sukkos shall you dwell" is to all of Israel, while "shall dwell in sukkos" is specifically "every citizen" of Israel. *Two grammatically distinct clauses, sitting one verse apart, describing what looks like the same act. The maamar is about to argue they are not describing the same act at all.*

סעיף ב · 1

ב) **והנה** גם בהישיבה בסוכות דישראל בכח עצמם, שני עניגים. בסוכות תשבו גו', וכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות. ומהחילוקים דשני העניגים, שבסוכות תשבו הוא בלשון ציווי, וישבו בסוכות הוא בלשון דסיפור והודעה. ועוד חילוק, שהציווי בסוכות תשבו הוא לכל ישראל (מעצמם), ואלו שישבו בסוכות (רק) האזרח בישראל.

And it is explained in the maamar that within encompassing lights there are two grades: the near encompassing light, and the far encompassing light. And the two matters, "dwell" and "shall dwell in sukkos," correspond to these two grades: "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the near encompassing light, and "shall dwell in sukkos" is the far encompassing light. And this is why, regarding "shall dwell in sukkos," the verse says "every citizen of Israel" — for "citizen of Israel" is the essence of the soul, which is rooted in the Essence, and dwelling in the far encompassing light is at the level of the essence of the soul. *"Citizen" (אזרח) is not incidental phrasing — the maamar reads it as naming a level of the soul, not merely a legal category of person. The near/far distinction in the light tracks a corresponding near/far distinction in what part of the person receives it.*

סעיף ב · 2

ומבאר בהמאמר, דבמקיפים יש ב' מדריגות, מקיף הקרוב ומקיף הרחוק. ושני הענינים דבסוכות ישבו בסוכות הם בשתי מדריגות אלו. בסוכות תשבו הוא במקיף הקרוב וישבו בסוכות הוא במקיף הרחוק. וזהו שגבי ישבו בסוכות אומר כל האזרח בישראל, דאזרח בישראל הוא עצם הנשמה שמושרשת בהעצמות, והישיבה במקיף הרחוק היא בהדרגא דעצם הנשמה.

And it may be said that this is why "shall dwell in sukkos" is not phrased as a command, but as narration and report: because the matter of command applies only at the level of the soul as clothed in the body, whereas in the soul as it is above [the body], and especially in the essence of the soul, there is no such thing as command. And the matter of "shall dwell in sukkos" — that the essence of the soul dwells in the far encompassing light — is (not because of a command, but) of its own accord, because its root is in the Essence. *A command presupposes a commanded party distinct enough from its source to be told what to do. The essence of the soul, rooted directly in the Essence, has no such distance to cross — it simply is where it is, which is why the verse only reports it rather than commanding it.*

סעיף ב · 3

יש לומר, דזהו שישבו בסוכות הוא לא בלשון ציווי דצ"ל, אלא בלשון סיפור והודעה, כי ענין הציווי שייך רק בדרגת הנשמה המלובשת בגוף, משא"כ בהנשמה שלמעלה, ובפרט בעצם הנשמה, אין ציווי. והענין דישבו בסוכות הוא שעצם הנשמה יושבת במקיף הרחוק, הוא (לא מפני הציווי) אלא מצד עצמה, לפי ששרשה הוא בהעצמות.

סעיף ב · 4

ומבאר בהמאמר, דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות הוא טעם על בסוכות תשבו. היינו דהכח על בסוכות תשבו, להמשיך מקיף הקרוב, הוא מפני שעצם הנשמה (האזרח בישראל) מושרשת בהעצמות (מקיף הרחוק). וצריך להבין, דהטעם (והכח) על בסוכות תשבו הוא (כמפורש בכתוב) כי בסוכות הושבתי, ולמה צריך גם להטעם דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות.

And the maamar explains that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is [itself] the reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell." That is: the power for "in sukkos shall you dwell," to draw the near encompassing light, is because the essence of the soul (the "citizen of Israel") is rooted in the Essence (the far encompassing light). And it needs to be understood: the reason (and power) for "in sukkos shall you dwell" is, as the verse itself makes explicit, "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" — so why is a further reason, "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos," also needed? *The maamar has now stacked two candidate reasons for the same command, and the question is why both are needed — an inquiry it answers by showing that section א's original two-clause structure and section ב's near/far structure are really the same fact seen from different angles, and each explanation reaches a different depth.*

SUMMARY

The sukkah draws two grades of encompassing light: the near, corresponding to the commanded "in sukkos shall you dwell," and the far, corresponding to the reported "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — a level of the essence of the soul itself, rooted in the Essence, where command does not apply because there is no distance left to command across.

SECTION 3

The real difficulty

BEFORE WE READ

Having named the near encompassing light, the maamar now presses on what "encompassing" actually means — and finds a genuine problem: encompassing light is defined by the very fact that it cannot settle into anything. So how could a week of sitting in a sukkah change it into a "settled light" at all?

סעיף ג

ג) **ויובן** זה בהקדים, דכיון שאורות המקיפים (כמו שהם מצד עצמם) אינם באים בהתיישבות, הרי זה שע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה נמשכים הם בפנימיות ובהתיישבות, הוא כמו שינוי באורות המקיפים. ויתירה מזו, דמלשון המאמר שע"י הישיבה בסוכה נמשכים אורות המקיפים בפנימיות ונעשים אורות מתיישבים (ולא ממשיכים אורות המקיפים בפנימיות ובהתיישבות) משמע, שהשינוי שנעשה ע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה הוא גם באורות המקיפים עצמם. דנוסף לזה שע"י הישיבה בסוכה הם נמשכים בפנימיות ובהתיישבות, גם אורות המקיפים עצמם משתנים להיות אורות מתיישבים. וצריך להבין, איך שייך שע"י עבודת האדם (ישיבה בסוכה) יהי' שינוי בהאורות דלמעלה.

סעיף ג · 1

This is understood by prefacing that, since encompassing lights (as they are in themselves) do not come into settledness, the very fact that Israel's sitting in the sukkah draws them into internality and settledness is itself like a change in the encompassing lights. And more than that: the maamar's own wording — that through sitting in the sukkah the encompassing lights are drawn into internality and *become* settled lights (rather than: are drawn into internality and settledness) — implies that the change wrought by Israel's sitting in the sukkah is in the encompassing lights *themselves*. That is: in addition to their being drawn into internality and settledness, the encompassing lights themselves are transformed into settled lights. And it needs to be understood: how is it possible that through a person's own act of avodah (sitting in a sukkah) a change should occur in the lights Above? *This is the maamar's real difficulty, and it is sharper than it first appears. It would be one thing to say a person's act lets him receive an unchanged encompassing light differently. It is another thing entirely to say the light itself — something entirely outside and above the person — is altered by what he does.*

סעיף ג · 2

והנה הפירוש דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (בפשטות) הוא, שישראל למטה (נשמות בגופים) צריכים לישב בסוכה (בפשטות). וע"פ הידוע[6] שכל הפירושים שבאותו הפסוק שייכים זה לזה, מובן, שגם הענין דישבו בסוכות במקיף הרחוק הוא ע"י הישיבה בסוכה כפשוטה.

Now, the plain-sense meaning of "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is that Israel below (souls clothed in bodies) must sit in a sukkah, in the plain sense. And according to the known principle[6] that all the meanings within a single verse are connected to one another, it is understood that the matter of "dwelling in sukkos" at the level of the far encompassing light is likewise [drawn] through the plain, literal sitting in a sukkah. *The principle being invoked is a real interpretive rule, not a convenience: a verse's mystical sense and its plain sense are not two unrelated readings layered on the same words, but two depths of one single meaning — which is exactly what makes the difficulty in this section a real one, and not merely a play on words.*

And it needs to be understood: it is explained in several places[7], on the verse[8] "for He is not a man, that He should relent" — that the matter of relenting and reconsidering (change) applies only within the category of "man," but within the category of "not man," relenting does not apply. And the reason for this is that change belongs principally to intellect: for within intellect there is a consideration for this and a consideration for that, and since "man" [in this technical sense] consists of intellect and emotive attributes, meaning that even a person's emotive attributes follow his intellect, therefore, when a change occurs in the intellect, the emotive attributes change as well. Whereas in a will that is above intellect — that is, an essential will that has no reason, not even a hidden one — there is no change. *This is a real technical distinction, not a rhetorical aside: change requires something that weighs options, and only intellect (and what follows from it) weighs options. A will with no reason at all — not even a reason too subtle to state — has nothing in it for change to act on.*

סעיף ג · 3

וצריך להבין, דהמבואר בכ"מ[7] עה"פ[8] כי לא האדם הוא להנחם, דענין ניחומין וחרטה (שינוי) שייך רק בבחינת אדם, אבל בבחינת לא אדם, אין שייך ניחומין. והטעם על זה הוא, כי ענין השינוי (בעיקר) בשכל, כי בשכל יש סברא לכאן וסברא לכאן, וכיון שאדם הוא מוחין ומדות, היינו שגם המדות שבאדם הם ע"פ השכל, לכן, כשנעשה שינוי בשכל משתנים גם המדות. משא"כ ברצון שלמעלה מהשכל, היינו רצון עצמי שאין לו טעם, גם לא טעם כמוס, אינו משתנה.

And so too Above: within the sefiros of Atzilus, and even within the externality of Keser (for even the externality of Keser is included within the category of "man"), change applies — but within the internality of Keser ("not man"), change does not apply. And on this basis it needs to be understood: the maamar implies that through Israel's sitting in the sukkah, the far encompassing light too is drawn [in a way involving change] — but on the face of it, how could change apply to the far encompassing light at all? *The far encompassing light was identified in section ב with the essence of the soul rooted in the Essence — exactly the "not man," beyond-intellect register where, by this section's own principle, no change should be possible. The maamar has, in effect, sharpened its own difficulty rather than dissolved it.*

סעיף ג · 4

ועד"ז למעלה, שבספירות דאצילות וגם בחיצוניות הכתר (שגם חיצוניות הכתר נכלל בבחינת אדם), שייך שינוי, אבל בפנימיות הכתר (לא אדם) אין שייך שינוי. ועפ"ז צריך להבין דמשמע מהמאמר שע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה נמשך גם מקיף הרחוק, דלכאורה, איך שייך שינוי במקיף הרחוק.

SUMMARY

Encompassing light, by definition, cannot settle — that is what "encompassing" means, as against "internalized." And change itself, by the principle of "not a man that He should relent," applies only where intellect operates; the far encompassing light, rooted in the essence of the soul beyond intellect, should by rights be no more subject to change than anything else in that register. The maamar has built its own hardest question: how can a week of sitting in a sukkah touch either light at all?

SECTION 4

The answer: from the Essence, no light is unsettleable

BEFORE WE READ

The resolution turns on relativity: "encompassing" and "cannot settle" are true of a light only relative to itself. Relative to the Essence — where the very distinctions of near/far, encompassing/internal do not obtain — nothing is fixed in place, and sitting in the sukkah is precisely what draws that level.

סעיף ד

The explanation may be said to be this: that an encompassing light is defined by not coming into settledness only as it is in itself — but from the side of the Essence of the Infinite Light, with respect to which there is no difference at all between encompassing and internal, even the encompassing can come into settledness. And through Israel's sitting in the sukkah, the encompassing lights are drawn from the Essence of the Infinite Light itself — and through this, the encompassing lights themselves become settled. *This is the same move the maamar's own sibling made about the will: a category (there, "against the will"; here, "cannot settle") holds only relative to a level that still has that category built into it. Relative to the Essence, which has no such category at all, the constraint simply does not apply — and what looked like a change in an unchangeable thing is really a drawing from a level where the thing was never fixed to begin with.*

סעיף ד · 1

ד) **יש** לומר הביאור בזה, דזה שמקיף הוא מוגדר בזה שאינו בא בהתיישבות הוא כמו שהוא מצד עצמו, אבל מצד עצמות אוא"ס, שלגבי' אין חילוק בין מקיף לפנימי, גם המקיף יכול לבוא בהתיישבות. וע"י שישראל יושבים בסוכה ממשיכים המקיפים מעצמות אוא"ס, ועי"ז גם אורות המקיפים נעשים מתיישבים.

And this is understood on the basis of the known teaching[9] in the interpretation of the verse "for our festive day" — that the matters of Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, which are in concealment (כסה) and hiddenness, become revealed on Sukkos. From which it is understood that the avodah of "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur — through which comes the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light (as below[10]). And through the avodah of "in sukkos shall you dwell," in that the drawing from the Essence of the Infinite Light through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur is [now] in open revelation, the encompassing lights too become settled lights. *This is the set's own hinge, stated plainly: Sukkos does not introduce a new theme after Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur, it reveals, in the open, what those days already accomplished in concealment. Everything the maamar builds from here draws on that identification with the sibling maamar's own teshuvah-of-Yom-Kippur.*

סעיף ד · 2

ויובן זה ע"פ הידוע[9] בפירוש הכתוב ליום חגינו (דהעניגים שבר"ה ויוהכ"פ הם בכסה בכסה והעלם) מתגלים הם בסוכות. דמזה מובן, שהעבודה דבסוכות תשבו הוא גילוי התשובה דיוהכ"פ, שעל ידה היא ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס (כדלקמן[10]). וע"י העבודה דבסוכות תשבו, שההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס שע"י התשובה דיוהכ"פ היא בגילוי, גם אורות המקיפים נעשים אורות מתיישבים.

DEEP DIVE · RELATIVE TO WHAT?

Why "cannot settle" was never an absolute fact

Section ג's difficulty rests on treating "encompassing light cannot settle" as a fixed property of the light itself — the way "water is wet" is a fixed property of water. Section ד's answer is that it was never that kind of fact. It is a fact about the light *relative to its own level*, and every level, without exception, has a further level relative to which its own defining constraints simply do not apply.

This is not a loophole invented to solve the difficulty; it is the same structural move this maamar's own two siblings make repeatedly. The sibling on Rosh Hashanah distinguishes an arousal that has "no place at all" in Atzmus from one that does, depending entirely on which level of Atzmus is meant. The sibling on Shabbos Shuvah distinguishes atonement for a breach of the will from a level where breach was never a coherent category, again purely by which level is in view. Here, "encompassing" and "cannot settle" turn out to be exactly this kind of relative fact: true of the light as it is in itself, false — because the categories do not even apply — as it is drawn from the Essence.

What earns the change, then, is not that a person's act somehow overpowers an immovable light. It is that sitting in the sukkah reaches past the light's own self-relative definition to the level where the distinction (encompassing versus settled) was never drawn in the first place — and draws the light *from there*.

SUMMARY

Encompassing light cannot settle only relative to itself; relative to the Essence, where encompassing and internal are not even distinct categories, it can. Sitting in the sukkah — the revealed form of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — draws the encompassing lights from that unconditioned level, which is why they can become settled without anything in the light itself being violated.

SECTION 5

A new self, root and all

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now asks why an act of avodah can draw the Essence at all — and answers by way of teshuvah's own nature: teshuvah does not repair the person who sinned, it makes a genuinely new person, and only a root untouched by the sin could be the source of that newness.

סעיף ה

And it may be said that the revelation of the essence of the soul, rooted in the Essence of the Infinite Light (above the root of the souls in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel"), is in teshuvah — through teshuvah itself. And the matter is this: that a person's doing teshuvah after he has sinned is from the side of the soul's root in the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel." For from the side of the soul's root in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," through sinning and flawing (the opposite of the intent of "with whom did He take counsel"), he becomes severed from his root — and that after sinning he does teshuvah and changes his very being is from the side of the revelation of the soul's root in the Essence of the Infinite Light, which is above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel." *"With whom did He take counsel" (established in the sibling maamar, section ז) named a real root — the souls of the righteous, prior to creation. That root can be severed by sin. What teshuvah reaches is deeper than even that root: a level the sin never touched, because it was never inside the relation the sin broke.*

סעיף ה · 1

ה) **ויש** לומר, שהגילוי דעצם הנשמה שמושרשת בעצמות אוא"ס (שלמעלה משורש הנשמות בהענין דבמי נמלך) הוא בהתשובה, שע"י תשובה עצמה. והענין הוא, דזה שהאדם עושה תשובה לאחרי שחטא הוא מצד שרש הנשמה בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מהענין דבמי נמלך. שמצד שורש הנשמה בהענין דבמי נמלך, ע"י שחטא ופגם (היפך הכוונה דבמי נמלך), הוא נפרד משרשו, וזה שלאחרי שחטא הוא עושה תשובה ומשנה את מציאותו, הוא מצד גילוי שורש הנשמה בעצמות אוא"ס, שלמעלה מהענין דבמי נמלך.

And there is a further matter in this: that the cause which brings a person back to teshuvah is that the point of Jewishness within him is always intact (and when the point of Jewishness within him is aroused, he wants, in no way whatsoever, to remain severed, and so does teshuvah) — and that the point of Jewishness within him is always intact, that even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful to Him[25], is because the soul's bond with G-dliness is an essential bond, above the bond that comes through Torah and mitzvos (the matter of "with whom did He take counsel"). *The bond that produces teshuvah cannot itself be a casualty of the sin, on pain of nothing ever driving anyone back — which is exactly why the maamar needs a bond deeper than the one sin can sever. "Even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful" is not sentiment; it is the load-bearing premise.*

סעיף ה · 2

ועוד ענין בזה, דהסיבה שמביאה אותו לחזור בתשובה היא לפי שנקודת היהדות שבו היא תמיד בשלימות (וכאשר מתעוררת נקודת היהדות שבו, אינו רוצה בשום אופן להיות נפרד ועושה תשובה), וזה שנקודת היהדות שבו היא תמיד בשלימות, דגם בשעת החטא היא באמנה אתו ית'[25], הוא לפי שההתקשרות דהנשמה באלקות היא התקשרות עצמית, שלמעלה מההתקשרות שע"י תומ"צ (הענין דבמי נמלך).

סעיף ה · 3

והחילוק דשני העניגים הוא, שהגילוי דעצם הנשמה בזה שגם לאחרי החטאים הוא שב להוי', הוא, שע"י שהחטאים נעשה נפרד מאלקות (שלכן צריך לעשות תשובה עליהם), אלא שכיון ששורש הנשמה הוא בעצמות אוא"ס שלמעלה מהעגין דבמי נמלך, הפירוד שע"י החטאים הוא רק בחיצוניות, ולכן ביכלתו לעשות תשובה (ע"י גילוי הפנימיות). והגילוי דעצם הנשמה בהסיבה שמביאה אותו לחזור בתשובה, הוא, שע"י החטאים לא נעשה מלכתחילה גרעון ח"ו בההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה באלקות, וגם בשעת החטא היא באמנה אתו ית' (והוא ע"ד שנתבאר לעיל בד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' שע"י[26]), דהכפרה שע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס בעל הרצון היא באופן שע"י החטאים נעשה פגם, וע"י ההמשכה מעצמות אוא"ס בעל הרצון שאינו מוכרח בהרצון, מתכפרים הפגמים. והכפרה שמצד עיצומו של יום הכפורים היא (לא באופן של פעולה, אלא) שביום זה מתגלה ההתקשרות של עצם הנשמה עם העצמות (שלמעלה מבעל הרצון), שבדרגא זו אין פגם מלכתחילה.

And the difference between the two matters [just given] is this: the revelation of the essence of the soul in the fact that even after sinning it returns to Havayah is that, through the sins, a severance from G-dliness occurs (which is why teshuvah is needed for them) — except that since the soul's root is in the Essence of the Infinite Light, above the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," the severance through the sins is only in externality, and so he is able to do teshuvah (through the revelation of his internality). Whereas the revelation of the essence of the soul in the very cause that brings a person to return in teshuvah is that, through the sins, no deficiency, Heaven forfend, was ever created to begin with in the essential bond of the essence of the soul with G-dliness — that even at the moment of the sin it remains faithful to Him (and this follows the pattern explained above in ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי'[26]): that the atonement drawn through the Essence of the Infinite Light as "Owner of the will" works by way of the sins having created a flaw, and the drawing from the Essence as Owner of the will — who is not compelled by the will — atoning for that flaw. Whereas the atonement from the side of "the essence of the day" of Yom Kippur is (not in the manner of an action at all, but) that on that day is revealed the bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence (which is above the "Owner of the will"), a level with respect to which there was never any flaw to begin with. *Two distinct roles for the same essence-level bond, mapped directly onto the sibling maamar's own two-tier atonement (the Owner of the will, versus the Essence above even Him): one register in which the bond is severed only externally and teshuvah repairs it; a deeper register in which the bond was never breached at all, and the day itself simply reveals that this was always so.*

סעיף ה · 4

ועפ"ז יש להוסיף ביאור בזה שעיצומו[27] של יום הכפורים מכפר (דוקא) לשבים[28], כי בכדי שתהי' המשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום, גילוי ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, צריכה להיות איזו עשי' דהאדם [וע"ד גילוי עצם הנשמה בר"ה, שהיא ע"י העבודה דתמליכוני עליכם[29]], וכיון שהסיבה המביאה לעשות תשובה היא התקשרות העצמית, לכן, ע"י התשובה היא המשכת הענין דעיצומו של יום.

And on this basis a further point may be added, explaining why the essence of the day[27] of Yom Kippur atones specifically for those who return[28]: because in order for the drawing of "the essence of the day" — the revelation of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — to occur, some action of the person is required [in the same way that the revelation of the essence of the soul on Rosh Hashanah is through the avodah of "that you make Me King over you"[29]]. And since the very cause that brings a person to do teshuvah is [already] the essential bond, therefore, through teshuvah comes the drawing of "the essence of the day." *A closing of the circle: the essence-bond is what makes teshuvah possible in the first place, and teshuvah is in turn the vessel that draws the revelation of that very bond into the open — cause and consequence folding back into each other, exactly as tov required chesed as its vessel in the sibling maamar's section ו.*

SUMMARY

Teshuvah does not merely repair a severed bond; in one register it does exactly that (the externally severed bond with the Owner of the will), but in its deeper register it reveals a bond that a sin could never touch to begin with — the essence of the soul's own root in the Essence. And it is precisely because this untouched bond is what drives a person back to teshuvah that teshuvah becomes the vessel for revealing it in the open.

SECTION 6

Out of the depths

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now reaches back to the sibling maamar's own vocabulary (revealed will, concealed will, absolute will) to explain a liturgical detail of the Ten Days: why the psalm said each day is *"Mi'maamakim"* — "out of the depths" — plural, and why King David, who has already said "with all my heart I have sought You," needs to add anything at all.

סעיף ו · 1

ו) **וביאור** הענין בפרטיות יותר יובן בהקדים מה שנתבאר לעיל (בהמאמר ד"ה יבחר לנו[30]), שבתקש"ז שע"י שעז"ה נעשה תמליכוני עליכם, ג' עניגים. קיום המצוה דתקש"ז, שהיא האתערותא דלתתא המעוררת את הרצון הגלוי, והתשובה דתקש"ז, שעל ידה נמשך ההחלט ורצון המוחלט ולמעלה יותר ברצון המוחלט בעצמותו שע"י אתעדל"ת יתעורר הרצון גלוי, והביטול הפנימי שמצד עצם הנשמה, שיע"ז נמשך רצון המוחלט עצמו.

The matter is understood in more detail by prefacing what was explained above (in the maamar ד"ה יבחר לנו[30]): that in the sounding of the shofar, through which "that you make Me King over you" is effected, there are three matters — the fulfilment of the mitzvah of the shofar, which is the arousal from below that arouses the revealed will; the teshuvah of the shofar, through which is drawn the [absolute will's own] determination that an arousal from below should arouse the revealed will, and further still, that the absolute will in its own essence decided that through an arousal from below the revealed will should be aroused; and the inner self-nullification from the side of the essence of the soul, through which the absolute will itself is drawn. *This is a direct citation of the Rosh Hashanah sibling's own three-tier map (mitzvah / teshuvah / essence-bittul), imported wholesale as the vocabulary this section will now apply to a different liturgical detail — the psalm of the Ten Days.*

סעיף ו · 2

וע"פ הידוע שהעניגים דבנין המלכות הוא במשך כל עשרת ימי תשובה, יש לומר, שגם בעשרת ימי תשובה צריכה להיות עבודה שמצד עצם הנשמה. וזהו שבעשרת ימי תשובה אומרים שיר המעלות ממעמקים, ואיתא בזוהר עמיקא דעמיקתא (מעמקים לשון רבים) אקרי תשובה. ומבאר כ"ק מו"ח אדמו"ר בהמשך הנ"ל שהם ב' העומקים דרצון הנעלם ורצון המוחלט בעצמותו. דההמשכה מהעומק דרצון הנעלם היא ע"י צעקת הקול הבאה מהמקיף דחי', וההמשכה דרצון המוחלט היא ע"י צעקת הלב הבאה מהמקיף דיחידה.

And on the basis of the known [teaching] that the matter of the building of kingship extends through the whole of the Ten Days of Repentance, it may be said that in the Ten Days too there must be an avodah from the side of the essence of the soul. And this is why in the Ten Days the psalm "Shir HaMa'alos, Mi'maamakim" ["out of the depths"] is said — and the Zohar states that "the depth of depths" (מעמקים being a plural form) is called teshuvah. And my father-in-law the Rebbe explains, in the Hemshech cited above, that these are the two depths of the concealed will and the absolute will in its own essence: the drawing from the depth of the concealed will is through the cry of the *voice*, which comes from the encompassing light of chayah, and the drawing of the absolute will is through the cry of the *heart*, which comes from the encompassing light of yechidah. *"Depths," plural, is not poetic excess — the maamar reads it as naming exactly two distinct depths, mapped onto the same chayah/yechidah pair the sibling maamar used for the shofar. The Ten Days have their own version of the same architecture.*

And elsewhere the Zohar states "Shir HaMa'alos" without specifying who said it — rather, "a song of ascents that all the people of the world are destined to recite." And the passage continues there: "and did David say this? Indeed it is written, 'with all my heart I have sought You'… so what more is wanted? What is wanted? It has been taught: every person…" — "from the root of all roots." And it is explained in Chassidus that the Zohar's own precision — "and did David say this?" — is that since David had already said "with all my heart I have sought You," where "my heart" is the innermost point of the heart, why would he need to say "out of the depths" [as well]? And the explanation is that one must draw from the root of all roots, from the innermost point of the Essence Itself — and to draw from there requires an avodah from the innermost point of the essence of the soul and the Essence, "out of the depths" — which is above the avodah from the inner point of the inner point of the heart ("with all my heart"). *A second liturgical puzzle folded into the first: even the innermost point of the heart is still, technically, a point within the heart — one degree of internality among others. "Out of the depths" names something the heart's own innermost point cannot reach on its own, which is why David needs both phrases, not one.*

סעיף ו · 3

ובמקום אחר איתא בזוהר שיר המעלות סתם ולא פירש מאן אמרו, אלא שיר המעלות דזמנין כל בני עלמא למימר. ובהמשך העגין שם וכי אמר דוד שם והכי כתיב בכל לבי דרשתיך כו' ומי בעי מאי בעי תאנא כל ב"נ כו' מעיקרא דכל עיקרין. ומבואר בחסידות, שהדיוק בזהר וכי אמר וכי דוד הכי הוא, דכיון שכבר אמר בכל לבי דרשתיך, שבבי הוא פנימיות הלב, מהו צריך לומר ממעמקים. ומבאר, שצריך להמשיך מעיקרא דכל עיקרין, מפנימיות ועצמות א"ס, ובכדי להמשיך משם הוא ע"י העבודה שמפנימיות ועצמות הנפש ועצמות א"ס, ממעמקים, שלמעלה מהעבודה מפנימיות דפנימיות הלב (בכל לבי).

DEEP DIVE

Two depths, and why the heart's own innermost point isn't enough

The Zohar's question — why does David, having already said "with all my heart," need to add "out of the depths" — sounds almost pedantic until the maamar's own distinction is applied to it. "With all my heart" reaches the innermost point *of the heart*: still, for all its depth, a point located within a faculty, addressable by that faculty's own internal structure.

"Mi'maamakim" — plural depths — names something structurally different: not a deeper point within the heart, but a source the heart's own internality was never going to reach by going further inward along the same axis. This is the same move section ד made about encompassing light: no matter how far "inward" a faculty's own internality goes, it stays inside that faculty's own register. Reaching the root of all roots requires a different kind of avodah entirely — not "more heart," but the essence of the soul reaching past the heart's own internality altogether.

This is why the Zohar insists the psalm is for "all the people of the world," not for David uniquely: the depth it draws from is the essence of the soul, which every person has in equal measure, unlike the trained, cultivated internality of "my heart," which differs from person to person.

SUMMARY

The Ten Days have their own version of the shofar's three-tier structure: an avodah from the essence of the soul, corresponding to the absolute will's own depth. "Out of the depths," plural, names two distinct depths — the concealed will (reached by the cry of the voice) and the absolute will in its own essence (reached by the cry of the heart) — and "the depth of depths" specifically is what the heart's own innermost point, however deep, cannot reach by itself.

SECTION 7

Deeper still on Yom Kippur

BEFORE WE READ

A short section, but a real escalation: the avodah of the Ten Days, however deep, is still an avodah that "belongs" to the revealed faculties in some sense. Yom Kippur's own avodah reaches a register above that relation entirely.

It may be said that on Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur [themselves], the avodah of "out of the depths" is loftier than the avodah of "out of the depths" on the days between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. For during the Ten Days of Repentance, whose matter is (as their name implies) days of teshuvah — and the matter of "that you make Me King over you" is not so openly revealed on these days — the avodah of "out of the depths" is principally at the depth of the essence of the soul *as it relates to* the revealed faculties. Whereas on Yom Kippur, whose principal matter depends on "you" [in the plural, essentially] — a matter that is principally from the side of the essence of the soul — the avodah of "out of the depths" is at the depth of the essence of the soul as it is *above any relation* to the revealed faculties. *A precise escalation, not a vague intensification: the Ten Days' depth still stands in relation to the revealed faculties (it reaches down to touch them); Yom Kippur's depth is the essence of the soul as it stands prior to and above that relation altogether — the same distinction, in a new key, that separated the Owner of the will from the Essence above Him in the sibling maamar.*

סעיף ז · 1

ז) **יש** לומר, דבר"ה ויוהכ"פ העבודה דממעמקים היא נעלית יותר מהעבודה דממעמקים שבהימים שבין ר"ה ליוהכ"פ. דבעשרת ימי תשובה, שענינם הוא (כשמם) ימי תשובה (והענין דתמליכוני עליכם אינו בגילוי כ"כ בימים אלה), העבודה דממעמקים (בעיקר) היא בהעומק דעצם הנשמה ששייכת לכחות הגלויים, וביוהכ"פ שעיקר ענינו תלוי מעליכם עליכם [דענין זה הוא בעיקר מצד עצם הנשמה], העבודה דממעמקים היא בהעומק דעצם הנשמה שלמעלה משייכות לכחות הגלויים.

And likewise regarding Yom Kippur: since its principal matter is the atonement from the side of the essence of the day — the revelation of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — therefore the avodah of Yom Kippur, too, is from the depth of the essence of the soul as it is above any relation to the revealed faculties.

סעיף ז · 2

ועד"ז ביוהכ"פ, דכיון שעיקר ענינו הוא הכפרה שמצד עיצומו של יום, גילוי ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, לכן, גם העבודה דיוהכ"פ היא מצד העומק דעצם הנשמה שלמעלה משייכות לכחות הגלויים.

IN AVODAH

There is a real, practical distinction here between two kinds of depth a person can reach in prayer. One kind still answers to the revealed faculties — it deepens what they can do, sharpens their reach, but stays legible to them. The other kind is not a deeper version of the same reaching; it is a register the revealed faculties were never going to arrive at by trying harder. Yom Kippur does not ask for more effort of the first kind. It asks for the second kind entirely — which is exactly why it cannot be manufactured by intensity alone, only received.

SUMMARY

The Ten Days' own "out of the depths" reaches the essence of the soul as it relates to the revealed faculties; Yom Kippur's reaches the essence of the soul as it stands above any such relation — matching Yom Kippur's own atonement, which (per section ה) is the revelation of a bond no flaw ever touched, not the repair of one that was.

SECTION 8

Closing the loop

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar returns to its opening verse and states the full answer: the sukkah's two reasons are two matters in Yom Kippur's own teshuvah, and the near/far distinction in the encompassing lights maps exactly onto the will/essence distinction the whole series has been building.

And this is "in sukkos shall you dwell… every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos… for I made [them] dwell in sukkos": that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" and "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos" are two reasons for "in sukkos shall you dwell" (as explained in the maamar of Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703, cited above in section ב). And the matter is that "in sukkos shall you dwell" is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur — and within the teshuvah of Yom Kippur there are three matters: teshuvah itself, and two matters in the root of teshuvah. For teshuvah itself (even the teshuvah of Yom Kippur) is that a person changes himself, going out of his previous state of being and becoming an entirely new being.

סעיף ח · 1

ח) **וזהו** בסוכות תשבו גו' כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות גו' כי בסוכות הושבתי גו', דכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות וכי בסוכות הושבתי גו' הם שני טעמים על בסוכות תשבו (כמבואר בהמאמר דהמשך ר"ה תש"ג, הובא לעיל סעיף ב). והענין הוא, דבסוכות תשבו הוא גילוי התשובה דיוהכ"פ, ובהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, ג' עניגים. התשובה עצמה, ושני עניגים בשרש התשובה. דהתשובה עצמה (גם התשובה דיום הכפורים) היא שהאדם משנה את עצמו, שיוצא ממציאותו הקודמת ונעשה מציאות חדשה.

This change is in the revealed faculties of the soul, and this change in a person's revealed faculties comes about through his arousing and revealing the essence of the soul within him. [And so too Above: that a person becomes desired before Him as he was before the sin is because through teshuvah a new will is drawn from the Infinite Light as "Owner of the will."] And there is a further matter in the teshuvah of Yom Kippur, felt in it openly: that the true root and cause of teshuvah is the bond of the essence of the soul — a bond above any prior relation to the revealed faculties — now reaching the revealed faculties.

סעיף ח · 2

הוא בכחות הגלויים דהנשמה. ושינוי זה שבכחות הגלויים דהאדם הוא ע"י שמעורר ומגלה עצם הנשמה שבו. [ועד"ז הוא בנוגע למעלה, דזה שהאדם נעשה מרוצה לפניו ית' כמו קודם החטא הוא, כי ע"י התשובה נמשך רצון חדש מאוא"ס בעל הרצון]. ועוד ענין בהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, שנרגש בה בגילוי, שהשורש והסיבה האמיתית דתשובה הוא ההתקשרות דעצם הנשמה (שלמעלה מההתקשרות לכחות הגלויים) לכחות הגלויים.

סעיף ח · 3

ולכן, גם בהענין דבסוכות תשבו (שהוא הגילוי דהתשובה דיוהכ"פ), ג' העניגים — השינוי במקיף הקרוב, שנעשה אור מתיישב. והטעם על זה הוא ע"פ המובא לעיל סעיף ו דזה ש[ע"י] אתעדל"ת מתעורר הרצון הגלוי (אף שהאתעדל"ת אינה באין ערוך לגבי הרצון) אינו מצד הרצון הגלוי עצמו (דכיון שהרצון הגלוי הוא באין ערוך לגבי הרצון אין שייך לעורר אותו ביכלתם), אלא לפי שכן החליט ברצון המוחלט. ועד"ז הוא בהענין דבסוכות תשבו, שהשינוי שנעשה כביכול במקיף הקרוב להיות אור מתיישב אינו מצד המקיף הקרוב עצמו, כי אם משום שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (במקיף הרחוק — כי בסוכות הושבתי).

And therefore, even in the matter of "in sukkos shall you dwell" (which is the revelation of the teshuvah of Yom Kippur), the same three matters [are present] — the change in the near encompassing light, that it becomes a settled light. And the reason for this follows what was cited above in section ו: that an arousal from below arouses the revealed will (even though the arousal from below is utterly incommensurate with the will) not from the side of the revealed will itself (for since the revealed will is utterly incommensurate with [an arousal from below], it is not within [the arousal's] own power to arouse it) — but because the absolute will so decided. And likewise regarding "in sukkos shall you dwell": the change that occurs, as it were, in the near encompassing light, that it becomes a settled light, is not from the side of the near encompassing light itself — but rather because "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" (at the level of the far encompassing light — "for I made [them] dwell in sukkos"). *The same non-negotiable point the sibling maamar made about the shofar returns here nearly verbatim: an incommensurate cause cannot arouse its effect by its own power. The near encompassing light's transformation into a settled light is not something the near light does or earns — it happens because the far light, the essence-level bond, already decided it would.*

סעיף ח · 4

דענין הישיבה (התיישבות) במקיף הרחוק אינו באופן דפעולה [כי במקיף הרחוק, בחינת לא אדם, אין שייך בו שינוי, כנ"ל סעיף ג], אלא שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות (מקיף הרחוק) מצד עצמם, לפי שהם מושרשים בהעצמות. [וזהו שאמרו רז"ל עה"פ[43] כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות למד שכל ישראל ראויים לישב בסוכה אחת, כי בדרגא זו כל ישראל שוים]. והוא ע"ד הענין דעיצומו של יום הכפורים, שמצד ההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות אין פגם מלכתחילה.

For the matter of "dwelling" (settledness) at the level of the far encompassing light is not in the manner of an action at all [since at the far encompassing light, the category of "not man," change does not apply, as above in section ג] — rather, "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" (the far encompassing light) [describes them dwelling there] of their own accord, because they are rooted in the Essence. [And this is what our Sages meant on the verse[43] "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — teaching that all Israel are fit to sit in a single sukkah, for at this level all Israel are equal.] And this follows the pattern of the essence of Yom Kippur, that from the side of the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence, there was never any flaw to begin with. *The far encompassing light's "settledness" was never an event, only a standing fact now disclosed — exactly parallel to Yom Kippur's own atonement, which is not an action either, but a revelation of a bond that was never broken. And "all Israel fit in one sukkah" stops being a technical halachic curiosity and becomes the same point section ה made about the essence of the soul: at that level, there is no differentiation between one Jew and another at all.*

סעיף ח · 5

וכמו שביוהכ"פ, הענין דעיצומו מאיר גם בגילוי דהתשובה דיוהכ"פ, שבהתשובה דיוהכ"פ (כנ"ל) נרגש שהיא נמשכת מההתקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות, עד"ז הוא בסוכות, שכל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות הוא טעם על בסוכות תשבו, דזה שמקיף הקרוב נמשך בפנימיות ונעשה אור מתיישב, נרגש בו שהטעם על זה הוא כל האזרח בישראל ישבו בסוכות, במקיף הרחוק, התקשרות העצמית דעצם הנשמה עם העצמות.

And just as on Yom Kippur, the matter of "the essence of the day" shines also within the revelation of Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — for within the teshuvah of Yom Kippur (as above) it is felt that it is drawn from the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence — so too on Sukkos: that "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" is the [deeper] reason for "in sukkos shall you dwell" means that in the very fact that the near encompassing light is drawn into internality and becomes a settled light, it is felt that the reason for this is "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" — at the level of the far encompassing light, the essential bond of the essence of the soul with the Essence. *The maamar's full circle: section א's opening puzzle — why does the commanded "you shall dwell" need the reported "I made dwell" as its reason — turns out to have the same shape as Yom Kippur's own structure of teshuvah revealing the day's essence. The near light's settledness doesn't merely depend on the far light causally; it is felt, in the act of sitting, as resting on it — the whole series' essence-theme surfacing, for a moment, inside a piece of wood and roofing.*

IN AVODAH

The sukkah is a strange mitzvah to build a theology of the essential soul around — seven days in a temporary structure, walls and a roof of branches. But that may be the point the maamar is quietly making with its own choice of verse. The far encompassing light, the level at which "all Israel are fit to sit in one sukkah," is not reached by more elaborate effort than the near light requires. It is reached by the same simple, physical, undramatic act — sitting down — because at that level the distinguishing marks a person usually measures himself by (how hard he tried, how much he understood) are exactly the marks that do not apply.

SUMMARY

"In sukkos shall you dwell" draws the near encompassing light into settledness; "every citizen of Israel shall dwell in sukkos" names the far encompassing light — the essence of the soul rooted in the Essence — which was never unsettled to begin with, only revealed. The near light's transformation is not its own doing, any more than the shofar's revealed will arouses itself; both happen because the absolute will, the essence-level bond, already decided they would. Sukkos is Yom Kippur's own teshuvah — three matters, the same three matters — made open and settled.

תורה צוה לנו משה

ד"ה תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב · יום שמחת תורה ה'תשכ"ג · מוגה

Torah Commanded to Us by Moshe

> *"Prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance" — and in the very same breath, "Torah is the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov."*

The argument at a glance

Seven moves closing the set: three words for how Torah belongs to a Jew — inheritance, gift, and a deeper inheritance still — mapped onto three names for a Jew — Yaakov, Yisrael, Yeshurun — and closing on Simchas Torah with the deepest identity of all: Yisrael, Torah, and the Holy One are one.

THE PUZZLE	א	"Torah commanded to us by Moshe, the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov" — yet the Sages say "prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance to you." Torah is called both a heritage and explicitly not one. And why does the very next verse suddenly rename Yisrael "Yeshurun"?
TWO TORAHS	ב	Torah as it refines the world (drawing a person to learn for his own sake, then for Torah's own sake) is "inheritance," reached through the sparks a Jew's own root in tikkun entitles him to. Torah as it is in itself, above all refining, is "not an inheritance" — it must be earned by learning entirely without ulterior motive.
RAIN AND DEW	ג	"My teaching shall drip like rain, flow like dew" — rain rises by evaporation from below; dew descends untouched. Torah's exoteric layer (rain) requires a person's own refinement to be revealed; Torah's esoteric layer (dew) is revealed regardless, which is why "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him."
A THIRD REGISTER	ד	Beyond inheritance and dew there is "gift" — the Holy One's own three hours a day of Torah study, from a place no arousal from below reaches at all, not even the esoteric layer's own.
THREE NAMES	ה	Yaakov, Yisrael, and Yeshurun are not synonyms: Yaakov is the name of a soul working to fix concealment; Yisrael the name of a soul with nothing to fix; Yeshurun — "a song with no beginning or end" — is the essence of the soul itself, prior even to having been drawn down at all.
ABOVE GIFT	ו–ז	The deepest inheritance of all is not received by any recipient's own standing (as ordinary inheritance is) but by a son who simply *stands in his father's place* — a level above even gift, which still depends on the giver's choice. And that choice itself, per the sibling maamar's own reading of "He shall choose our heritage," is where the two extremes finally meet: Yisrael, Torah, and the Holy One, one.

SECTION 1

A heritage, and not an inheritance

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar opens on the verse said as the Torah scroll is raised, and immediately presses on an apparent contradiction with a well-known Talmudic statement — the same move that opened the very first maamar in this series (יבחר לנו), and the last time this series will make it. סעיף א

"Torah, commanded to us by Moshe, is the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov"[1] — that the Torah is an inheritance to each and every member[2] of the congregation of Yaakov. And the difficulties here are well known: the Sages said[3], "Prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance to you" — and here it says that the Torah *is* an inheritance. It also needs to be understood: the plain meaning of "inheritance" is that a thing does not belong to the recipient by his own standing at all, but only because he inherited it from the root of his ancestors — yet all of Israel (their souls) were themselves present at Mount Sinai and received the Torah in their own persons. *The contradiction is doubled, not single: not only does one source call Torah an inheritance and another deny it, but "inheritance" itself seems like the wrong category for something every Jew personally stood and received.*

סעיף א · 1

תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב[1], שהתורה היא ירושה לכאו"א[2] שמקהלת יעקב. וידועים הדיוקים בזה, הרי אמרו רז"ל[3] התקן עצמך ללמוד תורה שאינה ירושה לך, וכאן נאמר שהתורה היא ירושה. גם צריך להבין, דפירוש ירושה בפשטות הוא (היינו שמצד עצמו אינו שייך להדבר אלא שירש זה משרש מאבותיו), והרי כל ישראל היו (נשמותיהם) במעמד הר סיני וקיבלו בעצמם את התורה.

It also needs to be understood: what is the connection of the verse immediately following[4] — "and there was a king in Yeshurun, when the heads of the people gathered, the tribes of Israel together" — to "the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov"? And further: in this verse Israel is called "the congregation of Yaakov," while in the next verse they are called, at its start, "Yeshurun" ("and there was a king in Yeshurun"), and at its close, "the tribes of Israel." *Three names for the same people, deployed across two adjacent verses in a pattern that seems too deliberate to be incidental: Yaakov, then Yeshurun, then Yisrael. Section ה will argue these are not interchangeable labels but three distinct levels.*

סעיף א · 2

גם צריך להבין, מהי השייכות דבפסוק שלאח"ז[4] נאמר ויהי בישורון מלך בהתאסף ראשי עם יחד שבטי ישראל, מהי השייכות דויהי בישורון מלך גו' למורשה קהלת יעקב גו'. גם, דבפסוק זה נקראים ישראל בשם ישורון (מורשה קהלת יעקב), ובהפסוק שלאח"ז נקראים בתחלתו בשם ישורון (ויהי בישורון מלך) ובסיום הפסוק נקראים בשם (יחד שבטי ישראל).

SUMMARY

Torah is called both an inheritance and explicitly not one, in a way ordinary "inheritance" (a thing belonging to the recipient only through his ancestors, not himself) cannot resolve — every Jew's soul stood at Sinai in person. And the verse names Yisrael three different ways across two lines: congregation of Yaakov, Yeshurun, tribes of Israel. Both puzzles turn out to be the same puzzle.

SECTION 2

Two Torahs, two kinds of belonging

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar's first move: Torah itself has two registers, and only one of them is reached through "inheritance" at all.

סעיף ב

And the crux of the explanation here (as is known from other discourses[5]) is that within Torah there are two matters. There is Torah as it is in itself — the wisdom and will of the Holy One — and there is Torah as it has descended below, blessing and refining the world, beginning with the refining and purifying of the person who learns it, whose animal-soul intellect is refined and purified and included in holiness[9]. And this is why the Sages said[11], "A person should always occupy himself with Torah and mitzvos even not for their own sake, for from not-for-its-own-sake one comes to for-its-own-sake" — for at the start of one's avodah, a person's engagement with Torah is in order to refine and purify his soul, as the Sages said[12], "At first, a person does [things] for his own sake" — that his engagement with Torah is to purify his own soul — "and through this he afterward comes" to engaging with Torah for its own sake, for the sake of Torah itself, which is above the matter of refinement altogether. *Two Torahs, not one Torah with two uses. The refining Torah is a process with a beginning (self-interest) and an end (Torah for its own sake) — a ladder. Torah "as it is in itself" is not the top rung of that ladder; it is off the ladder entirely, which is exactly the distinction the rest of the section turns on.*

סעיף ב · 1

ב) **ונקודת** הביאור בזה (כמובן מהדרושים[5]), דבתורה שני עניגים. דהתורה כמו שהיא מצד עצמה, שהיא חכמתו ורצונו של הקב"ה, וכמו שהתורה ירדה למטה, ומברכת ומזככת את העולם, מתחיל מהבירור והזיכוך שבאדם שהלומד, שהשכל דנפש הבהמית מתברר ומזדכך ונכלל בקדושה[9]. וזהו שאמרו רז"ל[11] לעולם יעסוק אדם בתורה ומצוות שלא לשמה שמתוך שלא לשמה בא לשמה, דבתחילת העבודה, עסק התורה דהאדם הוא בכדי לברר ולזכך את נפשו, כמאמר רז"ל[12] מעיקרא איניש כי עביד אדעתא דנפשי' קא עביד, שעסק התורה שלו הוא בכדי לזכך את נפשו, ועי"ז בא אח"כ לעסק התורה לשמה, לשם התורה עצמה (שלמעלה מענין הבירורים).

And this is why the Torah is called an inheritance, and nevertheless the Sages said "prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance": that the Torah's being called an inheritance is from the side of the refinements accomplished through Torah. For the sparks within physical matter — and likewise the sparks within the intellect of the animal soul — are rooted in *tohu*, chaos, whereas the root of the souls of Israel is in *tikkun*, rectification. This is why Esav is called "great" and Yaakov is called "small"[13]: for Esav's root is in tohu, whose lights are abundant ("great"), while Yaakov's root is in tikkun, whose lights are few and confined within vessels ("small"). And since Yaakov and Esav are brothers — as it is written,[14] "is not Esav a brother to Yaakov" — and brothers inherit from one another, therefore, through the souls of Israel refining the sparks, they inherit the [light of] tohu. *A striking piece of reasoning: inheritance-law logic (brothers inherit from each other) applied to the relationship between tohu and tikkun. Israel's entitlement to the abundant light of tohu isn't earned by refining it — it's inherited, by virtue of a fraternal relationship that predates any refining work at all.*

סעיף ב · 2

וזהו שהתורה נקראת ירושה ואעפ"כ אמרו התקן עצמך ללמוד תורה שאינה ירושה, דזה שהתורה נקראת ירושה הוא מצד הבירורים שע"י התורה. דהניצוצות שבדברים הגשמיים, וכן הניצוצות שבהשכל שבהנפש הבהמית, שרשם הוא בתוהו, והשורש דנשמות ישראל הוא בתיקון. דזהו שעשו נקרא גדול ויעקב נקרא קטן[13], כי שורש עשו הוא בתוהו, שהאורות דתוהו הם אורות מרובים (גדול), ושורש יעקב הוא בתיקון, שהאורות דתיקון הם אורות מועטים וכן מוגבלים בכלים (קטן). וכיון שיעקב ועשו הם אחים, כמ"ש[14] הלא אח עשו ליעקב, והאחים יורשים זה את זה, לכן, ע"י שנשמות ישראל מבררים את הניצוצות, הם יורשים דתוהו.

סעיף ב · 3

ומ"ש התקן עצמך ללמוד תורה שאינה ירושה לך הוא בנוגע להתורה כמו שהיא למעלה מענין הבירורים, דהמשכת בחינה זו דתורה היא ע"י לימוד התורה לשמה. וזהו התקן עצמך ללמוד תורה, שצריך שייגע עצמו שיהי' לימודו לשמה בלי כל פני' שום כלל (גם לא הפני' דלזכך את נפשו), וע"י לימוד התורה לשמה הוא ממשיך התורה כמו שהיא מצד עצמה. שדרגא זו דתורה היא למעלה גם מהאורות דתוהו (שישראל יורשים ע"י עבודת הבירורים), שאינה ירושה לך.

And what is said, "prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance to you," refers to Torah as it is above the matter of refinement — for the drawing of this dimension of Torah is through learning Torah for its own sake. And this is "prepare yourself to study Torah": that a person must exert himself so that his learning be entirely for its own sake, with no ulterior motive whatsoever — not even the motive of purifying his own soul — and through learning Torah for its own sake, he draws the Torah as it is in itself. For this level of Torah is above even the lights of tohu (which Israel inherit through the work of refinement) — it is *not* an inheritance to you. *The two verses are not in tension after all — they describe two different Torahs. What is inherited is the refining Torah, entitlement to the light of tohu, granted by fraternal relationship. What must be earned by effort with no ulterior motive at all is Torah "as it is in itself" — and calling that "not an inheritance" is exactly correct.*

SUMMARY

"Heritage" and "not an inheritance" describe two different Torahs. Torah as it refines the world is inherited — Israel's fraternal entitlement (via Yaakov and Esav) to the abundant light of tohu, reached through learning for the sake of self-purification and, eventually, for Torah's own sake. Torah "as it is in itself," above all refinement, is reached only by learning with absolutely no ulterior motive — and it is precisely this Torah that is "not an inheritance."

SECTION 3

Rain and dew

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now maps the same two-register structure onto a different verse and its own well-known image: Torah compared to rain, which requires evaporation from below to form, and dew, which descends without any such process.

סעיף ג · 1

ג) **וזהו** יערוף כמטר לקחי תזל כטל אמרתי[15], דמטר בא מהעננים שנעשים מהאדים שנעשים מלחות הארץ, ואד יעלה מן הארץ והשקה את פני האדמה[16]. וטל בא מלמעלה. דכמו"כ הוא ברוחניות, שמטר הוא ענין שבא ע"י בירור וזיכוך והעלאת המטה, כמאמר רז"ל[18] עה"פ יערוף כמטר לקחי גו', שברו את הבריות את ערפן מטר יורד, וטל הוא גילוי מלמעלה.

And this is "my teaching shall drip like rain, my speech shall flow like dew"[15]: rain comes from the clouds, which form from the vapors that rise from the moisture of the earth — "and a mist rose from the earth and watered the face of the ground"[16] — while dew comes from above. And so too in matters of the spirit: rain is a matter that comes about through refinement, purification, and a raising-up from below, as the Sages said[18] on the verse "my teaching shall drip like rain": "the moment the creatures bend their necks, the rain descends" — while dew is a revelation from above. *The physical image is doing real conceptual work: rain requires something to rise first (evaporation, or, spiritually, human effort) before it can descend; dew requires nothing to rise at all. Two different delivery mechanisms, not two different qualities of the same water.*

סעיף ג · 2

והטעם שהתורה נמשלה למטר ולטל הוא, כי בתורה שני עניגים. הענין דירידת התורה למטה בכדי לברר את העולם, דהמשכת ענין זה שבתורה הוא ע"י לימוד התורה אדעתא דנפשי' — יערוף כמטר לקחי. והתורה כמו שהיא מצד עצמה (כמו שהיא באצילות בי"ע), דהמשכת ענין זה שבתורה הוא ע"י עסק התורה לשמה — תזל כטל אמרתי. ואולי י"ל דעל זה אמרו[19] כל הקורא ושונה הקב"ה קורא ושונה כנגדו, שע"י עסק התורה לשמה המשכת התורה הוא המשכת וגילוי התורה כמו שהיא מצד למעלה, כמו הקב"ה קורא ושונה, טל דתורה[20].

And the reason Torah is compared to both rain and dew is that Torah has two matters within it. The matter of Torah's descent below in order to refine the world — the drawing of this matter is through learning Torah for one's own sake — "my teaching shall drip like rain." And Torah as it is in itself (as it is in Atzilus relative to Beriah-Yetzirah-Asiyah) — the drawing of this matter is through engaging in Torah for its own sake — "my speech shall flow like dew." And perhaps it may be said that this is the meaning of the statement[19] "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him": that through engaging in Torah for its own sake, the drawing of Torah is the drawing and revelation of Torah as it is from Above — like "the Holy One reads and reviews" — the dew of Torah[20]. *A remarkable reading of a well-known Talmudic image: "the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" is not poetic flattery of a diligent student. It names the specific mechanism — dew, unrelated to any rising-from-below — by which learning for Torah's own sake draws Torah's own, unrefined register.*

סעיף ג · 3

יש לומר, דשני עניגים אלה (מטר דתורה וטל דתורה) הם גלייא דתורה ופנימיות התורה[21]. שבנגלה דתורה שנתלבשה בדברים גשמיים, ובכדי שהאור יהי' בגילוי באדם הלומד את התורה הוא ע"י שיזכך את עצמו, וזהו שזכה נעשית לו סם חיים[22], דע"י שזוכה מלשון זיכוך אז דוקא נעשית לו סם חיים. ובפנימיות התורה האור האלוקי הוא בגילוי, ולהוסיף, שגם לאחרי שהאדם מזכך את עצמו, שאז גם בנגלה דתורה הוא בגילוי, אינו כהגילוי שבפנימיות התורה.

It may be said that these two matters — the rain of Torah and the dew of Torah — are the revealed (exoteric) dimension of Torah and the internal (esoteric) dimension of Torah[21]. For in the revealed dimension of Torah, which is clothed in physical matters, in order for the light to be revealed in the person learning the Torah, he must purify himself — and this is "if he merits, it becomes for him a potion of life"[22]: for it is specifically through meriting — in the sense of purifying — that it becomes for him a potion of life. Whereas in the internal dimension of Torah, the divine light is [already] revealed. And it should be added that even after a person purifies himself, so that the revealed dimension of Torah, too, is [now] revealed to him, it is still not like the revelation within the internal dimension of Torah. *Purification changes what the exoteric layer can show a person, but it never makes the exoteric layer's revelation equal to the esoteric layer's own — because the exoteric light is clothed in physical matter to begin with, and removing a concealment is never quite the same as light that was never concealed there in the first place.*

DEEP DIVE · THE MECHANISM, NOT THE METAPHOR

Why rain and dew is not just a figure of speech

It would be easy to read "Torah is like rain, Torah is like dew" as decorative parallelism — two pleasant images for the same underlying gift. The maamar insists otherwise: rain and dew name two structurally different *delivery mechanisms*, and the difference matters because it tracks a real difference in what a person's own effort can and cannot do.

Rain requires evaporation first — something has to rise before it can fall. Applied to Torah, this is exactly the refining Torah of section ב: a person's own effort (learning "for his own sake," then for Torah's sake) is the rising vapor, and what descends afterward — insight, revelation, the refined light of tohu he is entitled to inherit — is the rain. No effort, no rain.

Dew requires no such rising. It simply descends. Applied to Torah, this is Torah "as it is in itself" — and the maamar's boldest move is reading "the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" as literally describing this: a mode of revelation that isn't produced by the learner's effort at all, only occasioned by it (the learning must happen; it just isn't what produces the result, the way rain-producing evaporation is what produces rain).

Section ד will go one level deeper still and ask about a light that isn't even occasioned by effort in this way — the Holy One's own three hours a day, which the next section reads as a third register beyond both rain and dew.

SUMMARY

Rain (formed by evaporation from below) and dew (descending untouched) name Torah's two registers precisely: the exoteric layer, revealed through a person's own refining effort, and the esoteric layer, revealed regardless — which is why "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" describes dew, not rain.

SECTION 4

A third register: gift

BEFORE WE READ

Beyond inheritance (rain) and dew, the maamar names a third word for how Torah is given: *mattanah*, gift — reached through a סעיף ד Talmudic image even further removed from any human effort than dew itself.

סעיף ד · 1

ד) **והנה** נוסף לשני עניגים הנ"ל שבתורה (ירושה דתורה, והתקן עצמך ללמוד תורה), נקראת התורה בשם מתנה[24]. כהנוסח דברכת התורה נתן לנו את תורתו וחותמין נותן התורה, וחג השבועות נקרא[25] זמן מתן תורתנו. וענין המתנה שבתורה הוא למעלה גם מהענין דהתקן עצמך ללמוד תורה. והענין הוא[26], דהחילוק בין טל ומטר הוא, דירידת מטר תלוי' בעבודת האדם (כמ"ש[27] והי' אם שמוע גו' ונתתי מטר ארצכם גו'), וטל אינו תלוי בעבודת האדם (כמארז"ל[29] טל לא מיעצר), דכמו"כ הוא ברוחניות, דמטר היא ההמשכה שע"י אתעדל"ת, וטל היא ההמשכה מלמעלה מצד עצמה.

Now, in addition to the two matters mentioned above in Torah (the inheritance of Torah, and "prepare yourself to study Torah"), Torah is also called by the name "gift"[24] — as in the wording of the blessing on the Torah, "who has given us His Torah," and the seal, "who gives the Torah"; and the festival of Shavuos is called[25] "the time of the giving of our Torah." And the matter of gift within Torah is above even the matter of "prepare yourself to study Torah." And the matter is this[26]: the difference between dew and rain is that the descent of rain depends on human effort (as it is written,[27] "and it shall be, if you surely hearken… that I will give the rain of your land"), while dew does not depend on human effort (as the Sages said,[29] "dew is never withheld") — and so too in matters of the spirit: rain is the drawing that comes through an arousal from below, and dew is the drawing from Above of its own accord. *A third term enters, and it is already clear it can't simply be a third rung on the same ladder as rain and dew, since dew — Torah "for its own sake" — is already independent of effort. "Gift" will turn out to name something even less occasioned by human action than dew.*

סעיף ד · 2

ומזה מובן, דזה שנת"ל דבחינת טל תורה היא המשכת התורה כמו שהיא למעלה (ע"י עסק התורה לשמה) הוא בכללות, אבל בפרטיות, גם המשכת התורה כמו שהיא למעלה, כמו שהיא ע"י שהאדם קורא ושונה, כיון שההמשכה היא ע"י שהאדם קורא ושונה, נכללת בבחינת מטר דתורה, ובחינת טל תורה, היא דרגא יותר נעלית בתורה, שאינה נמשכת ע"י עסק התורה דהאדם (גם לא ע"י עסק התורה לשמה), והמשכתה היא מצד עצמה.

From which it is understood that what was said above — that the dew-level of Torah is the drawing of Torah as it is from Above, through engaging in Torah for its own sake — is true only in general terms. In particular, however, even this drawing of Torah as it is from Above, insofar as it comes about *through the person's own reading and reviewing*, is itself included within the rain-level of Torah — since the drawing occurs through the person's own act. The true dew-level of Torah is a yet loftier register within Torah, one not drawn through a person's engagement with Torah at all (not even engagement for its own sake), and its drawing is of its own accord entirely. *A genuine refinement, not a contradiction of section ג: even "the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him," precisely because it is opposite him — responsive to his own reading — still counts, on closer analysis, as occasioned by the person's act, and so belongs with rain after all. True dew is one level further removed even than that.*

סעיף ד · 3

וזהו שאמרו רז"ל[26] ג' שעות ראשונות הקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה, וידוע הדיוק בזה, הרי כל הקורא ושונה הקב"ה קורא ושונה כנגדו, ואעפ"כ אמרו שבג' שעות ראשונות הקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה במשך כל היום (זה לומד בשעה זו וזה לומד בשעה זו), הרי גם הקב"ה עוסק בתורה במשך כל היום, ואעפ"כ אמרו שבג' שעות ראשונות הקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה.

And this is what the Sages said: "the first three hours [of the day] the Holy One sits and occupies Himself with Torah" — and the difficulty here is well known: since "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" throughout the day (this one learns at this hour, that one learns at that hour), the Holy One is [in that sense] occupied with Torah the entire day — so why do the Sages single out specifically the first three hours as when "the Holy One sits and occupies Himself with Torah"?

סעיף ד · 4

ונקודת הביאור בזה, דזה שכל הקורא ושונה הקב"ה קורא ושונה כנגדו, זה שהמשכה היא למעלה מהאתעדל"ת (עסק התורה דהאדם), ולכן, ההמשכה היא לפי ערך האתעדל"ת. וזה שבג' שעות ראשונות הקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה כמו שהמשכה הוא מלמעלה מצד עצמה, ממקום שאין אתעדל"ת מגעת לשם. וענין זה הוא בחינת טל דתורה, כי שורש הטל הוא בג' שעות ראשונות דעתיק. וזהו השייכות דהקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה (טל תורה) לג' שעות ראשונות, כי ג' [שעות] ראשונות הם ג' ראשונות דעתיק.

And the crux of the explanation is this: "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" — this drawing, though it is above the arousal from below (a person's engagement with Torah), is nevertheless measured according to that arousal from below. Whereas "in the first three hours the Holy One sits and occupies Himself with Torah" describes a drawing that is from Above of its own accord entirely, from a place that no arousal from below reaches at all. And this matter is the true dew-level of Torah, for the root of dew is in the first three hours of Atik. And this is the connection of "the Holy One sits and occupies Himself with Torah" (the dew of Torah) to the first three hours — for the first three hours [of the day] are [rooted in] the first three [hours, so to speak] of Atik. *"Measured according to the arousal from below" is the precise technical point: even a drawing above human effort can still be proportioned to it, which keeps it tethered to that effort in a way true dew is not. The first three hours name a source above proportion altogether.*

סעיף ד · 5

יש לבאר זה ע"פ הידוע[31] שגם בפנימיות התורה יש פנימיות וחיצוניות. דזה שפנימיות התורה מדברת בהעניגים דהשתלשלות הגליא שבה [והוא ע"ד נגלה דתורה שמדברת בעניני העולם, אלא שנגלה דתורה מדברת בעניגים גשמיים, ופנימיות התורה מדברת בעניגים רוחניים]. ודרגא זו שבפנימיות התורה היא בבחינת השגה[32]. ועיקר הענין דפנימיות התורה הוא זה שהתורה היא התענוג דלמעלה, תענוג שלמעלה מהשגה.

This may be explained on the basis of the known [teaching][31] that even within the internal (esoteric) dimension of Torah there is an internal and an external layer. That the internal dimension of Torah speaks of the matters of the chain of worlds' own revealed dimension [in the same way that the revealed dimension of Torah speaks of the matters of the world — except that the revealed dimension of Torah speaks of physical matters, while the internal dimension of Torah speaks of spiritual matters] — this level within the internal dimension of Torah is [still] at the level of comprehension[32]. But the essential matter of the internal dimension of Torah is that Torah is the delight of Above, a delight that is above comprehension. *Even "esoteric Torah" has an outer shell and an inner core — Kabbalah's own conceptual content (which can be grasped) versus the sheer delight the deepest layer of Torah is, which by definition cannot be grasped at all, only received.*

סעיף ד · 6

ויש לומר, שההמשכה דפנימיות התורה ע"י התורה עצמה, שעל זה אמרו כל הקורא ושונה הקב"ה קורא ושונה כנגדו, הוא הענין דהתקן עצמך ללמוד תורה [הוא הגילוי שבפנימיות התורה, שמדברת בהענינים דהשתלשלות וכיו"ב]. וההמשכה דפנימיות התורה מצד עצמה, שעל זה אמרו ג' שעות ראשונות הקב"ה יושב ועוסק בתורה [ענין המתנה דתורה[33]] הוא בחי' תענוג שלמעלה מהשגה.

And it may be said that the drawing of the internal dimension of Torah *through Torah itself* — of which it is said "whoever reads and reviews, the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" — is the matter of "prepare yourself to study Torah" [the revelation within the internal dimension of Torah that speaks of the matters of the chain of worlds' own revealed side]. And the drawing of the internal dimension of Torah of its own accord — of which it is said "the first three hours the Holy One sits and occupies Himself with Torah" [the matter of the gift of Torah[33]] — is the level of delight that is above comprehension. *The three registers now align exactly: rain / inheritance corresponds to the refining Torah of section ב; dew / "not an inheritance" corresponds to esoteric Torah's own comprehensible layer; and gift corresponds to the delight beneath even that — a delight no learning, however selfless, can occasion, only receive.*

SUMMARY

Beyond rain (Torah drawn by human effort) and dew (Torah drawn independent of effort, but still proportioned to it — "opposite him"), there is a third register: gift, the Holy One's own three hours, drawn from a place no arousal from below reaches at all. This is Torah as sheer delight, above comprehension — deeper than even the esoteric layer's own conceptual content.

SECTION 5

Three names, three souls

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar now turns to the second half of its opening puzzle: the three names — Yaakov, Yisrael, Yeshurun — and argues they are not stylistic variation but three distinct levels of the soul, mapped exactly onto the three registers of Torah just established.

סעיף ה · 1

ה) **וזהו** תורה צוה לנו משה מורשה קהלת יעקב ויהי בישורון מלך בהתאסף ראשי עם יחד שבטי ישראל, דזה שהתורה היא ירושה לכל אחד מישראל הוא מצד בחינת יעקב שבהם (מורשה קהלת יעקב), והענין דהתקן עצמך ללמוד תורה שאינה ירושה לך הוא מצד בחינת ישראל, והמתנה דתורה היא מצד בחינת ישרון.

And this is "Torah, commanded to us by Moshe, is the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov" — "and there was a king in Yeshurun, when the heads of the people gathered, the tribes of Israel together": that Torah being an inheritance to each and every Jew is from the side of the dimension of Yaakov within him ("the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov"); the matter of "prepare yourself to study a Torah that is not an inheritance to you" is from the side of the dimension of Yisrael; and the gift of Torah is from the side of the dimension of Yeshurun. *The mapping is now explicit: Yaakov corresponds to inherited Torah (rain), Yisrael to earned, not-inherited Torah (dew), Yeshurun to gifted Torah — the deepest register of all.*

סעיף ה · 2

והענין הוא, דיעקב הוא בחינת עקב כמ"ש[34] שמע יעקב עבדי ישראל בחרתי בו[35]. והעבודה דיעקב היא[37] שהוא עובד אלקים, לתקן ההסתר הנמשך משם אלקים. וישראל הוא על שם כי שרית עם אלקים[38], שמושל ושולט על שם אלקים. וזהו שאיתא בזהר[39] שישראל ויעקב הם נגד ב' השמות הוי' ואלקים, דלגבי בחינת יעקב י' עקב, ישנו ההסתר דשם אלקים ועבודתו היא לתקן ההסתר. וגם לאחרי שמתקן ההסתר דשם אלקים, שעי"ז נמשך הגילוי דהוי', הוא הגילוי דהוי' כמו שהוא ע"י בחינת ישראל, שלגבי' אין מלכתחילה ההעלם וההסתר דשם אלקים, ונמשך הגילוי דהוי' עצמו.

And the matter is this: Yaakov is the dimension of *eikev*, "heel," as it is written,[34] "Hear, Yaakov My servant, Yisrael whom I have chosen"[35]. And the avodah of Yaakov is[37] that he serves Elokim, working to rectify the concealment drawn through the name Elokim. Whereas Yisrael is so called from "for you have striven [*sarisa*] with G-d"[38] — one who rules and governs the name Elokim. And this is what the Zohar states[39]: that Yisrael and Yaakov correspond to the two names Havayah and Elokim — that with respect to the dimension of Yaakov, [the letter] *yud* [of] *eikev*, there is the concealment of the name Elokim, and his avodah is to rectify that concealment. And even after he has rectified the concealment of the name Elokim, through which the revelation of Havayah is drawn, it is [still] the revelation of Havayah *as accomplished through rectification*. Whereas the revelation of Havayah as it is through the dimension of Yisrael has, from the outset, no concealment of the name Elokim to begin with — the revelation of Havayah itself is drawn. *Not two names for one avodah, but two different starting conditions: Yaakov begins inside a concealment and works to fix it; Yisrael was never inside that concealment at all. The soul-level difference tracks exactly the Torah-level difference between rain (produced by effort against an obstacle) and dew (revealed with no obstacle to begin with).*

סעיף ה · 3

ומבואר בלקו"ת[41] שהעבודה בשבת (בדרך כלל) היא בבחינת ישראל, עבודת הבירורים, לתקן ההסתר דשם אלקים, ויכל אלקים[42], שכלתה מדת הצמצום וההסתר דשם אלקים ונמשך הגילוי דהוי', ולכן אין צריך אז עבודת הבירורים, והעבודה דשבת היא להתענג על הוי', שלמעלה מעבודת הבירורים.

And it is explained in Likkutei Torah[41] that the avodah on Shabbos (in general) is [actually] at the level of Yisrael, not the avodah of refinement to rectify the concealment of the name Elokim — "and Elokim ceased"[42], that the attribute of constriction and concealment of the name Elokim ceased, and the revelation of Havayah is drawn — so that the avodah of refinement is not needed then; the avodah of Shabbos is rather to delight in Havayah, which is above the avodah of refinement.

DEEP DIVE

Yaakov's week and Yisrael's Shabbos

The maamar's identification of Shabbos avodah with the level of Yisrael, not Yaakov, sharpens what would otherwise sound like a purely etymological point into a lived weekly rhythm. The six days of the week are, in this reading, Yaakov's own domain: a soul working against real concealment, refining sparks, rectifying what obstructs. That is not a lesser mode — it is the entire avodah of refinement this maamar's section ב grounded Torah's status as "inheritance" in.

Shabbos does not intensify that work; it steps outside its whole framework. "And Elokim ceased" is read not as G-d resting from labor but as the very attribute that produced the concealment — constriction itself — ceasing to operate. There is, for that day, no concealment left to rectify, which is exactly the condition the maamar defined as Yisrael's own: not victory over an obstacle, but the absence of one.

This has a direct practical shape. Six days of real, effortful refinement are not a lesser preparation for a "higher" seventh day — they are Yaakov's own avodah, complete in itself. Shabbos is not more of that avodah; it is a different register entirely, delight rather than labor, exactly mirroring dew's independence from rain.

סעיף ה · 4

ובבחינת ישורון ישראל היא למעלה גם מבחינת ישראל. דישורון הוא מלשון שיר, דבר עגול כטבעת שאין לו ראש וסוף[43]. ומבואר בלקו"ת[44] דזהו שישראל נק' בשם ישורון הוא מצד שרש הנשמות כמו שעלו במחשבה. יש לומר, דהחילוק שבין ישורון לישראל, אף שגם הענין דישראל על שם כי שרית עם אלקים הוא מצד הגילוי דשורש הנשמה שלמעלה מהתלבשות בגוף [וכמבואר בכ"מ[45] דיעקב הוא הנשמה שמלובשת בגוף וישראל הוא שורש הנשמה שלמעלה מהתלבשות בגוף], דישראל הוא בחינת בן (כנ"ל), דלשון ועגין בן שייך דוקא לאחרי שהבן נמשך ממוח האב, וישורון הוא עצם הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בעצמותו ית', בדוגמת הבן כמו שהוא במוח האב עצמו (טרם שנמשך).

And the dimension of Yeshurun is a level of Yisrael that is above the dimension of Yisrael itself. For Yeshurun is from the word *shir*, "song" — something round like a ring, that has no beginning or end[43]. And it is explained in Likkutei Torah[44] that Yisrael is called by the name Yeshurun from the side of the root of the souls as they arose in [divine] Thought. It may be said that the difference between Yeshurun and Yisrael is this: although the matter of Yisrael too — "for you have striven with G-d" — is from the side of the revelation of the soul's root above its clothing in a body [as is explained elsewhere[45], that Yaakov is the soul as clothed in a body and Yisrael is the soul's root above being clothed in a body] — still, Yisrael is [only] the dimension of a *son* (as above), and the term "son" applies specifically *after* the son has [already] been drawn forth from the father's mind. Whereas Yeshurun is the essence of the soul as it is rooted in His very Essence — comparable to the son as he is [still] within the father's own mind (before having been drawn forth at all). *A genuinely fine distinction: Yisrael is already a "son" — a distinct, drawn-forth entity, even at its highest, root level. Yeshurun names something prior to that distinction altogether — not yet drawn forth as anything separate, which is exactly why it has "no beginning or end": those categories only apply to something that has already emerged.*

סעיף ה · 5

וזהו שישורון הוא מלשון שיר שאין בו ראש וסוף, כי בהדרגא דהנשמות כמו שנמשכו כבר ממוח האב (גם כמו שהם למעלה) ישנם חילוקי דרגות, והענין דשיר שאין בו ראש וסוף הוא שהם כעצם הנשמות כמו שהם מושרשים באוא"ס. וזהו מ"ש ויהי בישורון מלך ואיתא בלקו"ת[44] שזה קאי על ר"ה, שתתחלקוני עליכם, כי הענין דתמליכוני עליכם הוא ע"י גילוי עצם הנשמה כמו שהיא מושרשת בעצמות אוא"ס.

And this is why Yeshurun is from the word "song" that has no beginning or end: for at the level of souls as they have already been drawn forth from the father's mind (even as they are Above), there exist distinctions of level. And the matter of "a song with no beginning or end" is that they are as the essence of the souls, as they are rooted in the Infinite Light. And this is what is meant by "and there was a king in Yeshurun" — and it is stated in Likkutei Torah[44] that this refers to Rosh Hashanah, "that you make Me King over you" — for the matter of "that you make Me King over you" comes about through the revelation of the essence of the soul as it is rooted in the Essence of the Infinite Light. *A direct thread back to the very first maamar of this series: the coronation of Rosh Hashanah and the "song with no beginning or end" of Yeshurun name the same underlying reality — the essence of the soul, prior to any distinction of level, which is exactly what "that you make Me King over you" reaches.*

SUMMARY

Yaakov, Yisrael, and Yeshurun are three distinct levels, not synonyms. Yaakov works against real concealment; Yisrael's root was never inside that concealment; Yeshurun is prior even to the distinction that makes a soul a "son" at all — the essence of the soul as it is rooted in the Essence itself, "a song with no beginning or end," the same level Rosh Hashanah's coronation reaches.

SECTION 6

Where the three registers land

BEFORE WE READ

Having mapped Torah's three registers onto the soul's three names, the maamar assigns each register its proper home. סעיף ו

And this is the connection of these three matters in Israel (Yaakov, Yisrael, and Yeshurun) to the three matters in Torah: the matter of Torah's inheritance, which is from the side of refinement [for through the refinements of Torah one inherits the lights of tohu, as above in section ב], is from the side of the dimension of Yaakov — for the avodah of refinement is at the level of Yaakov. And the matter of "prepare yourself to study Torah," through which, by engaging in Torah for its own sake, the revelation of Torah as it is Above (the internal dimension of Torah) is drawn, is from the side of the dimension of Yisrael — for the engagement with Torah at the level of Yisrael is not in order to refine, but in order to draw a revelation of G-dliness. And the matter of the gift of Torah, which is the drawing of the delight of Torah (above comprehension) — a delight above all distinction of level — is from the side of the dimension of Yeshurun. *The full correspondence, stated plainly: refinement/inheritance/Yaakov; for-its-own-sake/dew/Yisrael; delight-above-comprehension/gift/Yeshurun. Three parallel three-tier structures, locking together.*

סעיף ו · 1

וזהי השייכות דגי' הענינים אלה שבישראל (יעקב, ישראל וישורון) לג' עניגים שבתורה, דענין הירושה שבתורה שהוא מצד הבירורים [שע"י הבירורים דתורה יורשים את האורות דתהו, כנ"ל סעיף ב], הוא מצד בחינת יעקב, דעבודת הבירורים היא בבחינת יעקב. והענין דהתקן עצמך ללמוד תורה, שע"י עסק התורה לשמה נמשך הגילוי דתורה כמו שהיא למעלה (פנימיות התורה), הוא מצד בחינת ישראל, דעסק התורה דבחינת ישראל הוא (לא בכדי לברר, אלא) בכדי להמשיך גילוי אלקות. וענין המתנה דתורה שהוא המשכת התענוג דתורה (שלמעלה מהשגה) הוא למעלה מהתחלקות הוא מצד בחינת ישרון.

IN AVODAH

The practical shape of this mapping is worth sitting with. A person does not graduate out of Yaakov's avodah of refinement into something higher and leave it behind — the maamar's own sibling on Sukkos made the same point about mitzvah, teshuvah, and essence-bittul all operating in a single act at once. Here too: the same hour of learning Torah can be, simultaneously, refining one's own understanding (Yaakov), reaching past all self-interest (Yisrael), and touching a delight that has nothing to do with what is understood at all (Yeshurun) — not three different achievements at three different times, but three depths of one act.

SUMMARY

Torah's three registers land precisely on the soul's three names: inherited/refining Torah is Yaakov's; earned, not-inherited Torah is Yisrael's; gifted Torah, delight above comprehension, is Yeshurun's.

SECTION 7

The deepest inheritance of all

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar's final and hardest move: a fourth reading of "inheritance," deeper than gift itself, that resolves the puzzle of why Yeshurun — clearly the loftiest name — is not the one paired with the word "inheritance" in the opening verse.

סעיף ז

And it needs to be understood: according to the explanation above, the reason Torah is called by the name "inheritance" is because Torah *brings about* an inheritance (that through the refinements accomplished by Torah, one inherits the lights of tohu) — yet the plain meaning of "Torah… is a heritage" (for a verse never departs from its plain sense[47]) is that Torah *itself* is the inheritance[48]. *A real gap: the explanation so far makes Torah the cause of an inheritance (of the lights of tohu), but the verse's plain sense says Torah is the inheritance. Something has been left unexplained.*

סעיף ז · 1

ו) **וצריך** להבין, דלפי ביאור הנ"ל, הטעם שהתורה נקראת בשם ירושה הוא לפי שהתורה מביאה לירושה (שע"י הבירורים שע"י התורה יורשים אורות דתהו), והפירוש דתורה גו' מורשה (בפשטות, דאין מקרא יוצא מידי פשוטו[47]) הוא, שהתורה עצמה היא ירושה[48].

And it may be said that the matter of Torah's inheritance — on the reading that Torah itself is the inheritance — is loftier still than the matter of the gift of Torah. For what is cited above from the other discourses, that Torah's inheritance is lower than gift, is[49] because [ordinary] inheritance depends on the existence of the heir (who is a relative of the testator) and is not dependent on the testator's will, whereas a gift is from the side of the giver's own will. This [account] applies to an inheritance that is only from the side of kinship. *The maamar is about to distinguish two entirely different senses of "inheritance." The first — inheritance by kinship, which merely requires being a relative — really is lower than gift, since it depends on nothing but a biological fact, not on any relationship to the giver's will at all.*

סעיף ז · 2

ויש לומר, דענין הירושה דתורה (להפירוש שהתורה עצמה היא ירושה) הוא למעלה יותר גם מענין המתנה דתורה. דזה שמובא לעיל מהדרושים דירושה דתורה היא למטה ממתנה, הוא[49] לפי שירושה היא לפי שיריך מציאותו של היורש (שהוא קרובו של המוריש) ואינה תלוי' ברצון המוריש, ומתנה היא מצד רצונו של הנותן. דענין זה הוא בירושה שהיא (רק) מצד קורבה.

סעיף ז · 3

אבל בירושה שענינה הוא[50] שהיורש עומד במקום המוריש (ובמילא יורש את נכסיו), אין שייך לומר שהיא באה מצד מציאותו של היורש, כיון שהיורש אינו מציאות אחר מהמוריש אלא עומד במקום המוריש. ואדרבה, ירושה זו היא למעלה ממתנה. דמתנה היא מצד רצון הנותן, ובירושה (באופן זה) היורש עומד במקום המוריש (שלמעלה מהרצון שלו). ועפ"ז צריך לומר, דהטעם שבענין הירושה דתורה (שהיא למעלה גם ממתנה דתורה) נאמר מורשה קהלת יעקב, הוא, כי ישראל וישורון הם שם למעלה, ולכן שייכים לענין הגילויים, וענין הירושה שהיורש עומד במקום המוריש עצמו מתגלה בהשם יעקב, כאשר הוא שם העצמות, שבו כל ישראל שוים.

But in the kind of inheritance whose significance is[50] that the heir *stands in the testator's own place* (and thereby inherits his possessions), it cannot be said that it comes from the side of the heir's own standing at all — since the heir is not a separate entity from the testator, but stands in the testator's own place. On the contrary: this kind of inheritance is *above* gift. For a gift is from the side of the giver's will, whereas in this kind of inheritance the heir stands in the testator's own place — which is above even the testator's own will. And on this basis it must be said: the reason that in the matter of Torah's inheritance (which is loftier even than the gift of Torah) the verse says "the heritage of the congregation of *Yaakov*," is that Yisrael and Yeshurun are names that pertain to revelation — [levels] that pertain to the matter of [distinguishable] revelations — whereas the matter of an inheritance in which the heir stands in the testator's own place is revealed specifically in the name Yaakov, since it is the name of the [very] essence — the level at which all of Israel are equal. *The maamar's real payoff, and its resolution of the opening puzzle from section א: it is not despite being the "lowest" name that Yaakov is paired with the deepest inheritance — it is because Yaakov, unlike Yisrael and Yeshurun, names a level with no distinguishing content of its own to reveal, and is therefore the exact name for a level where the heir has no standing distinct from the One he inherits from at all.*

DEEP DIVE · A SON WHO IS NOT A RECIPIENT

Why the deepest inheritance outranks the deepest gift

This section's distinction is easy to state and easy to underrate: two things are both called "inheritance," and only one of them is what the earlier comparison (inheritance is lower than gift, since gift depends on the giver's will and inheritance merely on kinship) was actually about.

Ordinary inheritance — by kinship — is a fact about the *heir*: he exists, he is a relative, therefore he inherits. It requires nothing at all from the one bequeathing, which is exactly why it ranks below a gift, which at least requires the giver's own considered will.

The deeper inheritance the maamar names is not a fact about the heir at all. "The heir stands in the testator's own place" means there is, in the relevant sense, no second party — no heir distinct enough from the testator to be the subject of a transaction, willed or otherwise. A gift needs two parties: a giver and a receiver, connected by an act of will. This kind of inheritance needs only one — because the heir simply *is*, in this respect, the testator, continuing.

This is why Yaakov, and not the loftier-sounding Yisrael or Yeshurun, is the name paired with this inheritance. Yisrael and Yeshurun name real, if progressively deeper, levels of the soul — but a level is exactly a distinguishing content, a "something" the soul is, which is precisely what a genuine heir-in-the-testator's-place cannot have. Yaakov's very smallness (section ב's "Yaakov is called small") turns out to be the qualification, not the disqualification.

SUMMARY

There are two kinds of inheritance. Ordinary inheritance, by kinship alone, ranks below gift — it depends on nothing from the giver. But an inheritance in which the heir stands in the testator's own place ranks above gift, because it has no second party for a gift's will to be directed toward at all. This deepest inheritance is revealed specifically through the name Yaakov — the name of the essence, where all Israel are equal — not the more distinguished-sounding Yisrael or Yeshurun.

SECTION 8

One, undivided

BEFORE WE READ

The maamar closes by explaining why this deepest inheritance — belonging to Yaakov, the "smallest" name — is nonetheless what produces the most complete unity: Yisrael, Torah, and the Holy One as one.

continued ,סעיף ז

סעיף ז · 4

ז) **וצריך** להבין, דהענין דעצם הנשמה שמצד זה כל ישראל הם מציאות אחת, קהלת יעקב, הוא לא מפני שנרגש בהם עילוי שלמעלה [ע"ד ההתאחדות דישורון מלשון שיר, שהוא ע"י גילוי המקיף שלמעלה מהתחלקות] שהרי יעקב הוא מלשון עקב, ובעקב אין נרגש עילוי, אלא אחדות עצמית. ועד"ז הוא בנוגע להתאחדות דישראל בענין הריקוד בעקביים.

And it needs to be understood: the matter of the essence of the soul, by which all of Israel are one single entity — "the congregation of Yaakov" — is not because any loftiness from Above is *felt* in them [in the way the unity of Yeshurun, from the word "song," is felt, through the revelation of an encompassing light above all distinction] — for Yaakov is, after all, from the word *eikev*, "heel," and in a heel no loftiness is felt at all, only essential unity. And likewise regarding the unity of Israel in the matter of dancing on their heels. *A pointed contrast with Yeshurun's own unity: the "song with no beginning or end" is a felt, revealed oneness — you can sense the encompassing light that produces it. Yaakov's unity is not felt at all, precisely because it is not a revelation of anything; it is bare essential sameness, which is why it shows up, fittingly, at the heel — the least distinguished, most equal part of the body.*

סעיף ז · 5

וע"י הענין דקהלת יעקב, מתגלה הענין דמורשה, ירושה דתורה, שישראל אורייתא וקוב"ה כולא חד. דבמתנת דתורה, יש ג' עניגים. הנותן המקבל והמתנה (תורה), משא"כ בענין הירושה דתורה, ישראל ואורייתא וקוב"ה כולא חד.

And through the matter of "the congregation of Yaakov," the matter of "heritage" — the inheritance of Torah — is revealed: that Israel, the Torah, and the Holy One are entirely one. For in the gift of Torah there are three matters — the giver, the recipient, and the gift (Torah) — whereas in the matter of the inheritance of Torah, Israel, the Torah, and the Holy One are entirely one. *The clearest statement yet of why inheritance-in-the-testator's-place outranks gift: a gift structurally requires three distinct things (giver, gift, recipient); this inheritance requires none of that structure, because there is, at this level, no real separation between the parties to begin with.*

סעיף ז · 6

וצריך להבין, דהענין דעצם הנשמה שמצד זה כל ישראל הם בשוה, מודגש יותר (לכאורה) בהשם ישורון, ואעפ"כ השם ישורון שייך לענין (התורה) הנתון לרצון, וגבי ירושה ששייכת להמוריש עצמו נאמר מורשה קהלת יעקב. ויובן זה בהקדים מ"ש[52] יבחר לנו את נחלתינו גו' וענין שני עניגים. יבחר לנו, ענין הבחירה, וענין הירושה.

And it needs to be understood: the matter of the essence of the soul, by which all of Israel are equal, is (seemingly) more pronounced in the name Yeshurun — and yet the name Yeshurun pertains to something given by [an act of] will, while regarding an inheritance that pertains to the testator Himself, the verse says "the heritage of the congregation of *Yaakov*." This is understood by prefacing what is written,[52] "He shall choose our heritage for us" — where there are two matters: "He shall choose," the matter of choice, and the matter of heritage. *This closes the loop back to the very first maamar of the series, whose entire discourse was built on this same verse — "He shall choose our heritage for us" — and its own choice/heritage pairing.*

סעיף ז · 7

יש לומר, דענין הבחירה שהקב"ה שבחר בישראל הוא, שהיא מצד רצון הנותן (שבחר לרצות בהם). ועוד ענין בזה, שגם הבחירה עצמה היא הסיבה שהיא הפלאת העצמות (שאינו מוכרח בשום דבר ויכול לרצות ולא לרצות), ולא העצמות עצמו.

It may be said that the matter of the choice by which the Holy One chose Israel is from the side of the giver's own will (that He chose to desire them). And there is a further point here: that the choice itself is [only] the cause that is the wondrousness of the Essence (that He is not compelled by anything, and can either will or not will) — and not the Essence Itself. *Even divine choice, for all its exaltedness, is still a form of willing — an act, a relation between a chooser and something chosen. It is the hafla'ah, the wondrousness of the Essence's freedom, not the bare Essence beneath even that freedom.*

סעיף ז · 8

ועפ"ז יש לבאר שבענין מתנה נאמר השם ישורון ובענין ירושה השם יעקב, דמתנה היא שהיא מצד רצון הנותן (כנ"ל), באה מצד הבחירה (שבחר לרצות). כמ"ש בברכת התורה אשר בחר בנו מכל העמים (ולכן) ונתן לנו את תורתו. וכיון שענין הבחירה הוא הפלאת העצמות שאינו מוכרח בשום דבר, לכן, הכלי לזה הענין הוא דישורון מלשון שיר, עיגול שאין בו ראש וסוף, העילוי וההפלאה דעצם הנשמה שהיא למעלה מהתחלקות דראש וסוף. וענין הירושה, שישראל מושרשים בהעצמות עצמו, מתגלה בהשם יעקב, שם העצם דישראל.

And on this basis it may be explained why, regarding gift, the name Yeshurun is used, and regarding inheritance, the name Yaakov: gift, being from the side of the giver's own will, comes from the side of choice (that He chose to desire [them]) — as it is written in the blessing on the Torah, "who has chosen us from among all the nations" and (therefore) "and has given us His Torah." And since the matter of choice is the wondrousness of the Essence that is not compelled by anything, therefore the vessel fitting for this matter is Yeshurun, from the word "song" — a circle with no beginning or end — the loftiness and wondrousness of the essence of the soul, which is above the distinction of beginning and end. Whereas the matter of inheritance — that Israel are rooted in the Essence Itself — is revealed through the name Yaakov, the name of Israel's own essence. *Gift and choice share a structure (a willing giver, a chosen recipient) that even wondrousness cannot escape — which is why gift's proper name is Yeshurun, the exalted, felt unity of a "song." Inheritance-in-the-testator's-place has no such structure to escape, which is why its name is the unglamorous, unfelt Yaakov.*

סעיף ז · 9

ויש לומר, דזה שבפסוק יבחר לנו נאמר את נחלתינו, הוא מצד הענין דנחלתינו, שהעצם הנשמה שמושרשת בהעצמות עצמו, יומשך בגילוי[55]. וכמו שבר"ה עיקר ההדגשה דנחלתינו הוא גאון יעקב, אלא שמבקשים שענין זה יומשך בגילוי, עד"ז הוא בשמח"ת, שעיקר ההדגשה היא מורשה קהלת יעקב. ואומר קהלת יעקב, שמצד הענין דיעקב, כל ישראל הם מציאות אחת (קהל), ע"ד שבר"ה אתם נצבים גו' נצבים כאחדים לאחדים כאחד[56]. וזהו שמצות היום (דשמח"ת) הוא בריקודים, דריקוד הוא ברגליים, וברגליים עצמם — בהעקב שבהם (יעקב מלשון עקב), שכל ישראל שוים בזה.

And it may be said that the fact that the verse "He shall choose for us" adds "our heritage" is from the side of the matter of "our heritage" itself: that the essence of the soul, rooted in the Essence Itself, should be drawn into revelation[55]. And just as on Rosh Hashanah the principal emphasis of "our heritage" is the pride of Yaakov — except that what is requested is that this matter be drawn into revelation — so too on Simchas Torah, the principal emphasis is "the heritage of the congregation of Yaakov." And it says "congregation of Yaakov" — that from the side of the dimension of Yaakov, all of Israel are a single entity (a congregation) — in the manner of "you stand [today], all of you," on Rosh Hashanah, "standing as one, united as one"[56]. And this is why the mitzvah of this day (Simchas Torah) is dancing: for dancing is [done] with the feet, and with the feet themselves — at the heel within them (Yaakov, from the word *eikev*) — where all of Israel are equal in this. *The dancing on Simchas Torah is not incidental festivity — it is this entire discourse made physical. The heel is chosen by the body's own geometry to be the least distinguished, most equal point, exactly matching Yaakov's own theological role.*

סעיף ז · 10

ולהוסיף, דזה שכל ישראל מתאחדים להיות מציאות אחת, קהלת יעקב, הוא לא מפני שנרגש בהם עילוי שלמעלה [ע"ד ההתאחדות דישורון מלשון שיר, שהוא ע"י גילוי המקיף שלמעלה מהתחלקות] שהרי יעקב הוא מלשון עקב, ובעקב אין נרגש עילוי, אלא אחדות עצמית. ועד"ז הוא בנוגע להתאחדות דישראל בעניני הריקוד בעקביים. וע"י הענין דקהלת יעקב, מתגלה הענין דמורשה, ירושה דתורה, שישראל אורייתא וקוב"ה כולא חד. דבמתנת התורה, יש ג' עניגים. הנותן המקבל והמתנה (תורה), משא"כ בענין הירושה דתורה, ישראל ואורייתא וקוב"ה כולא חד.

And it may be added: that all of Israel unite to be a single entity, "the congregation of Yaakov," is not because any loftiness from Above is felt in them [in the way the unity of Yeshurun, from "song," is felt, through the revelation of the encompassing light above all distinction] — for Yaakov is from the word "heel," and in the heel no loftiness is felt, only essential unity. And likewise regarding the unity of Israel in the matter of dancing on the heels. And through the matter of "the congregation of Yaakov," the matter of "heritage" — the inheritance of Torah — is revealed: that Israel, the Torah, and the Holy One are entirely one. For in the gift of Torah there are three matters — the giver, the recipient, and the gift (Torah) — whereas in the matter of the inheritance of Torah, Israel, the Torah, and the Holy One are entirely one. *The maamar closes by restating, almost verbatim, its own central formula — a deliberate repetition, not an accident, underscoring that everything else in the discourse was building toward this single equation.*

סעיף ז · 11

והמשכת ענין זה (מורשה, ירושה דתורה) בשמח"ת, היא בשמחה גדולה. ומשמח"ת נמשך זה על כל השנה כולה, שתהי' שנה שמיחה בלימוד התורה בלי שום מניעות ועיכובים, שמפני זה נתאוו כל ישראל וכו' לימות המשיח כי אז לא יהי' שום מונע ומעכב מלעסוק בתורה ובמצוות כדרוש[57], ועד שיהי' דעה את הוי' כמים לים מכסים[58], בביאת משיח צדקנו בקרוב ממש.

And the drawing of this matter (heritage, the inheritance of Torah) on Simchas Torah is with great joy. And from Simchas Torah this is drawn over the entire year, that it should be a year of joy in the study of Torah with no hindrances or obstacles at all — which is why all of Israel yearn for the days of Mashiach, for then there will be no hindrance or obstacle at all to engaging in Torah and mitzvos as they should be[57], until there is knowledge of Havayah "as the waters cover the sea"[58], with the coming of our righteous Mashiach, truly soon.

IN AVODAH

The series that opened on Rosh Hashanah with a coronation no angel could witness, moved through Yom Kippur's atonement that repairs nothing because nothing there was ever broken, through a sukkah built from light that by definition cannot settle — closes here, on Simchas Torah, with dancing. Not a deep meditation, not an elevated comprehension: feet, and the heel specifically, the least exalted part of a person, moving in unison with every other Jew's. The maamar's own claim is that this is not a comedown from everything that preceded it. It is where all of it was always heading — because the deepest thing a person has was never the part that could be singled out as impressive to begin with.

SUMMARY

There are two kinds of inheritance: by kinship (below gift) and by the heir standing in the testator's own place (above gift, since it needs no giver-recipient structure at all). This deepest inheritance is revealed through Yaakov — not Yisrael or Yeshurun — because Yaakov names the level with no distinguishing content to reveal, "the heel," where all Israel are simply equal. Through this level, Israel, Torah, and the Holy One are one — the formula the maamar restates as its own closing word, danced rather than said, on Simchas Torah.

Combined source notes

All footnotes from all four maamarim, grouped by maamar and kept under each maamar's own original numbering (1–N) rather than renumbered continuously — every in-body reference in the sections above points to its own maamar's list here. VERIFIED *marks a citation independently confirmed;* AS CITED *marks a citation reproduced as the source printing gives it, without independent retrieval. For תורה צוה and בסוכות תשבו, treat every locator as unconfirmed for exact page/volume numbers without an independent read against the original scan — see Method above.*

1. יבחר לנו את נחלתינו — Let Him Choose Our Heritage for Us

✳ המאמר הוגה ע"י כ"ק אדמו"ר שליט"א ויצא לאור בקונטרס ראש השנה – תנש"א. — The publisher's note at the head: the maamar was edited by the Rebbe and released in Kuntres Rosh Hashanah 5751. VERIFIED — corroborated independently by the year-indexed register, which also marks it [המשך: א].

1 תהלים מז, ה. — Psalms 47:5. VERIFIED

2 סה"מ ה'תש"ג ס"ע 26 ואילך. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, from p. 26 onward: the Frierdiker Rebbe's ד"ה יבחר לנו in Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703, the base text of this discourse. AS CITED

3 תרומה כה, ח. — Exodus 25:8. VERIFIED

4 בסיומו (סה"מ שם ע' 35). — At the conclusion of that maamar, Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 35. AS CITED

5 ראשית חכמה שער האהבה פ"ו קרוב לתחילתו (ד"ה ושני פסוקים – סט, ב). אלשיך עה"פ תרומה שם קרוב לסופו (ד"ה עוד יתכן – פט, א בדפוס ווארשא תרל"ה). של"ה סט, א. רא, א. שכה, ב. שכו, ב. לקו"ת ר"פ נשא (כ, סע"ב). ובכ"מ. — Reishis Chochmah, Shaar HaAhavah ch. 6; the Alshich on Exodus 25:8 (Warsaw 5635 printing); Shelah, four folio references; Likkutei Torah, opening of Parshas Naso; and elsewhere. All real works; the six internal folio locators are not confirmed here. AS CITED

6 מפרשים לתהלים שם. — The commentators on Psalms 47:5. A class reference rather than a locator. AS CITED

7 פסוק ו'. — Psalms 47:6. VERIFIED

8 ויק"ר פכ"ט, ג. וראה עד"ז במדרש תהלים עה"פ. — Vayikra Rabbah 29:3; and see similarly Midrash Tehillim on the verse. VERIFIED — 29:3 is the standard locus for the two-thrones exposition.

9 כ"ה בויק"ר שם, דענין "מתמלא עליהם רחמים וכו'" הוא **לאחרי** שמביא הפסוק הוי' בקול שופר. — An argument about the midrash's own ordering: "He is filled with mercy" comes *after* the second verse-half is quoted. Not a bibliographic claim but a reading of the text at note 8. AS CITED

10 סידור (עם דא"ח) רלח, ב. המשך וככה תרל"ז פרק פב-פג. סה"מ תרצ"ט ע' 28. ובכ"מ. וראה גם לקו"ת דרושים לר"ה נו, ג. — Siddur im Dach; Hemshech *V'chachah* 5637, chs. 82–83; Sefer HaMaamarim 5699 p. 28; Likkutei Torah, Derushim l'Rosh Hashanah. AS CITED

11 והראי' מן התורה על שאר הענינים שנמשכים ע"י תק"ש היא בפסוקי שופרות, כבס' שבהערה הקודמת. — The Torah-proof for everything *else* the shofar draws is in the pesukei shofros. Division of labour between the psalm and the shofros verses; picked up again at note 62. VERIFIED (internal)

12 להעיר מסידור האריז"ל במקומו, שע"י אמירת מזמור זה מהפכים מדה"ד למדה"ר… (ולא שעי"ז ממשיכים (מביאים ראי') שזה יהי' ע"י תק"ש). וראה לקמן הערה 62. — The Arizal's siddur assigns the flipping of judgment to mercy to *the saying of the psalm itself*, not to its function as a proof for what the shofar will do — a different account from the maamar's plain reading, flagged here and reconciled at note 62. AS CITED

13 כמבואר בארוכה בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל – סה"מ ה'תש"ג ע' 24. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 24, for choice being in Atzmus. AS CITED

14 ראה בהמאמר שם (ריש ע' 27) "דענינה הפנימי (של האהבה אשר אהב סלה) הוא **הרחמים**". ואולי יש לומר, דבהמאמר מפרש, דמ"ש בתרגום "**דרחים** לעלמין" הכוונה בזה היא גם לרחמים. — The inner content of the love in "whom He loved" is mercy; and Targum's דרחים may therefore carry the sense of mercy as well as love. AS CITED

15 המשך ר"ה הנ"ל בתחלתו. וראה פע"ח שער ר"ה. שער הכוונות שם. ובכ"מ. — Hemshech Rosh Hashanah at its beginning; Pri Etz Chaim, Shaar Rosh Hashanah; Shaar HaKavanos. AS CITED

16 כ"ה הלשון בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל שם. ולכאורה הכוונה, דבר"ה יש גם הענין דזכרונות ושופרות, אבל העיקר הוא מלכיות. וראה לקו"ש ח"ד ע' 1354, ובהערות שם. — Why the Hemshech says "principal": the day also has remembrances and shofros, but kingship is chief. Likkutei Sichos vol. 4 p. 1354. AS CITED

17 ר"ה טז, א. שם לד, ב. — Rosh Hashanah 16a; 34b. VERIFIED

18 שם כו, ב (במשנה). שם כז, א. — Rosh Hashanah 26b (in the Mishnah); 27a. VERIFIED

19 וראה רס"ג, הובא באבודרהם טעמי התקיעות, אשר "**הענין הראשון**" בתק"ש הוא, שאז "אנו ממליכין עלינו את הבורא". — Rav Saadya Gaon, brought in the Abudraham's reasons for the tekios: the first of them is that we thereby crown the Creator over ourselves. AS CITED

20 שקאי על **תקיעת** שופר (אלא שנכלל בזה גם אמירת פסוקי שופרות) – ראה תו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' כד; ע' כו, ובהערות שם. — "With a shofar" refers to the sounding, though the saying of the shofros verses is included. Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei pp. 24, 26. AS CITED

21 כ"ה בלקו"ת דרושים לר"ה נח, ב. ובכ"מ. וראה תו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' לה ואילך. AS CITED

22 בתפלת מוסף דר"ה, מר"ה כז, א. — In the Rosh Hashanah Musaf, from Rosh Hashanah 27a. VERIFIED

23 כ"ה בלקו"ת ובאוה"ת שבהערה הבאה. ובכ"מ. וראה לקמן ס"ו עוד פירוש ב"תחילת מעשיך" שקאי על ישראל. — And see below, section ו, for a further reading of "the beginning of Your works" as referring to Israel. Forward reference; both readings are needed in section ו. AS CITED

24 לקו"ת שם נח, ב-ג. אוה"ת ר"ה כרך ה ע' ב'כא ב'עט. — Likkutei Torah; Ohr HaTorah Rosh Hashanah vol. 5. AS CITED

25 כ"ה בהמשך ר"ה ה'תש"ג הנ"ל (ע' 19). ובכ"מ. ובאגה"ק סי"ד (קכ, ב) "מסתלק לשרשו בכל **ערב** ר"ה"; "**בערב** ר"ה". אבל לקמן שם (קכא, רע"א) "שמסתלק **בליל** ר"ה". — Iggeres HaKodesh 14 says the withdrawal is on the *eve* of Rosh Hashanah in one place and on the *night* of Rosh Hashanah a folio later. The divergence is recorded, not harmonised — a model of the מוגה register. AS CITED (Iggeres HaKodesh 14 as the locus is standard; the folio locators are as printed.)

26 המשך ר"ה הנ"ל (ע' 38). ובכ"מ. AS CITED

27 סידור (עם דא"ח) שער התקיעות רמו, ב ואילך. — Siddur im Dach, Shaar HaTekios. Cited twice, for the weary-worker image and for the withdrawal being at every level. AS CITED

28 ראה לקו"ד כרך א ה, סע"א. — Likkutei Diburim vol. 1, for the aphorism about the world in a state of faint. AS CITED

29 ראה מכילתא (ויל"ש) עה"פ יתרו כ, ג. תו"כ ופרש"י עה"פ אחרי יח, ב. וראה המשך ר"ה הנ"ל פכ"ו (ע' 69). ולהעיר מברכות יג, א (במשנה): שיקבל עליו עול מלכות שמים תחלה ואח"כ מקבל עליו עול מצוות. — Mechilta / Yalkut Shimoni on Exodus 20:3; Toras Kohanim and Rashi on Leviticus 18:2; Hemshech Rosh Hashanah ch. 26; and Berachos 13a in the Mishnah, on accepting the yoke of heaven before the yoke of mitzvos. VERIFIED for Berachos 13a; AS CITED for the rest.

30 ברמב"ם הל' תשובה פ"ג ה"ד "אע"פ שתק"ש בר"ה גזירת הכתוב, רמז יש בו כו' וחזרו בתשובה". אבל ראה לקו"ש ח"ד ע' 1145 ואילך (וראה גם לקמן ס"ט), שגם ע"י התשובה א"א להגיע לדרגא זו. — Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 3:4; and Likkutei Sichos vol. 4 p. 1145ff., that teshuvah too cannot reach this level — with a forward reference to section ט, where teshuvah is given its actual address. VERIFIED for the Rambam; AS CITED for the Likkutei Sichos page.

31 סד"ה שה"מ ממעמקים עדר"ת (המשך תער"ב ח"א ע' תד). — The Rebbe Rashab's 5671 ד"ה שיר המעלות ממעמקים, in Hemshech Ayin-Beis vol. 1. The source for malchus-as-revelation, and cited again at notes 35 and 38. AS CITED

32 המשך תער"ב שם. וראה בארוכה המשך תער"ב ח"ב פשפ"ח ואילך (ע' תשצז ואילך). סה"מ תרפ"ז ע' כד ואילך. ובכ"מ. AS CITED

33 כ"ה בהמשך תער"ב שם פשפ"ט (ע' תת) לאופן השני. AS CITED

34 תקו"ז בהקדמה ("פתח אליהו") – יז, א. — Tikkunei Zohar, introduction, *Pasach Eliyahu*: "kingship is the mouth." VERIFIED

35 ראה ד"ה שה"מ שבהערה 31 "שהכוונה בהמשכת המלכות בר"ה הוא להיות גילוי המלוכה למטה". וראה תו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' קז. AS CITED

36 ד"פעול" קאי על עשי' (סידור האריז"ל במקומו. משנת חסידים מסכת ליל ר"ה פ"ח מ"ב. הובאו בלקו"ת שלח מז, א), ו"**כל** פעול" הוא גם הדומם שבעשי'. — "Deed" refers to Asiyah, per the Arizal's siddur and Mishnas Chassidim, brought in Likkutei Torah Shelach; and "*every* deed" extends to the inanimate within Asiyah. The philological ground for the whole descent-to-domem argument. AS CITED

37 ראה תו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' קז. וראה עד"ז לקו"ת דרושים לר"ה נט, ד. עט"ר שער ר"ה ספי"ט. — Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei; Likkutei Torah; Ateres Rosh, Shaar Rosh Hashanah. AS CITED

38 בסד"ה שה"מ עדר"ת דלעיל הערה 31. וראה בהמאמר שם פקצ"ז (המשך תער"ב שם ע' תא). AS CITED

39 ראה תו"א וירא יד, סע"ב ואילך. — Torah Ohr, Vayera. AS CITED

40 ראה סידור (עם דא"ח) שם רמה, סע"ג ואילך. AS CITED

41 יבמות סא, רע"א. — Yevamos 61a. VERIFIED

42 לקו"ת נצבים מז, ב. — Likkutei Torah, Nitzavim. AS CITED

43 ויק"ר רפכ"ט. ועוד. – נסמן תו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' מא הערה 7. — Vayikra Rabbah, beginning of ch. 29, for the world's creation on 25 Elul; further references collected in Toras Menachem. AS CITED

44 ראה ר"ן לר"ה טז, א ד"זה היום תחלת מעשיך כו'" "על יצירת אדם קאמרינן". — The Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16a: "the beginning of Your works" is said of the forming of man. Read against note 23, which gives the worlds-reading; the maamar needs both. AS CITED

45 כ"ה בד"ה זה בהמשך ר"ה תש"ג (ע' 35). — Souls and malchus are one matter, from the Frierdiker Rebbe's maamar on this same verse. AS CITED

46 ורמז בחינה זו בשופר הוא המיצר שבו – לא מיצר דעוונות, כ"א זה שהוא "עם" ולא במרחב העצמות ששם מושרש. ולכן זה נוגע בהעצמות (עיין ד"ה שה"מ בהמשך ר"ה הנ"ל. המשך ר"ה תרצ"ה בסופו). — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. AS CITED for the two internal locators; the מיצר/מרחב language is that of Psalms 118:5, VERIFIED.

47 סה"מ עטר"ת ע' שב ואילך. ה'ש"ת ע' 18. ובכ"מ. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5680 p. 302ff.; 5700 p. 18. AS CITED

48 ב"ר פ"א, ד. — Bereishis Rabbah 1:4, for ישראל עלו במחשבה. VERIFIED

49 ב"ר פ"ח, ז. רות רבא פ"ב, א (ג). — Bereishis Rabbah 8:7; Rus Rabbah 2:1(3), for במי נמלך. VERIFIED

50 ישעי' ס, כא. — Isaiah 60:21. VERIFIED

51 ראה יד, א. — Deuteronomy 14:1, בנים אתם להוי' אלקיכם. VERIFIED

52 רבינו בחיי עה"פ וישב לח, ל. שעהיוה"א רפ"ז (פא, ב). ועוד. – נסמן בתו"מ סה"מ תשרי ע' רלד הערה 86. — Rabbeinu Bachye on Genesis 38:30; Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah, beginning of ch. 7, for אין מלך בלא עם. VERIFIED for Shaar HaYichud VeHaEmunah ch. 7 as the standard Chabad locus; AS CITED for the rest.

53 סה"מ ה'תש"ג ע' 6 ואילך. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 6ff.: the three levels of will. The same page-6 locator as note 56. AS CITED

54 ראה ע"ח שער כח (שער העיבורים) פ"ב. שער לט (שער מ"ן ומ"ד) דרוש ב. ועוד. — Etz Chaim, Shaar 28 (Shaar HaIburim) ch. 2; Shaar 39 (Shaar Man u'Mad) derush 2, for העלאת מ"ן מיני' ובי'. AS CITED — the gate names are as printed; internal *anaf*/derush placement not confirmed here.

55 סה"מ שם ע' 15 ואילך. — Sefer HaMaamarim 5703 p. 15ff.: that an arousal from below has no intrinsic worth. AS CITED

56 שהיא כעין מלכותא דרקיע (ברכות נח, א), שלכן "ממלכותא דארעא יש לבאר ולהסביר ענין מלכותא דרקיע" (המשך ר"ה הנ"ל רפ"ב – ע' 6). — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. VERIFIED for Berachos 58a; AS CITED for the Hemshech locator.

57 שופטים יז, טו. — Deuteronomy 17:15 (Parshas Shoftim), שום תשים עליך מלך. VERIFIED

58 ראה לקו"ש ח"ח ע' 26. — Likkutei Sichos vol. 8 p. 26. AS CITED

59 רמב"ם דלעיל הערה 30. — The Rambam of note 30. Internal cross-reference. VERIFIED (internal)

60 וע"ד המובא לעיל ס"ז, שההחלטה על ההמשכה דבריאת העולמות היתה ע"י ישראל שעלו במחשבה העצמית, כי ע"י ישראל דוקא נשלמת הכוונה דבריאת העולמות. — Treated in full in the commissioned deep dives. Internal cross-reference to section ז. VERIFIED (internal)

61 להעיר מסד"ה גדול יהי' כבוד הבית הזה ה'תשכ"ב (תו"מ סה"מ אב ע' קיט ואילך). — The Rebbe's 5722 ד"ה גדול יהיה כבוד הבית הזה, Toras Menachem Sefer HaMaamarim Av p. 119ff. AS CITED

62 ויש לומר, דבפסוקי שופרות מדובר (גם) בענין ההמשכה בעולם (בנין המלכות) שע"י תק"ש דישראל – רצון המוחלט כמו ששייך לרצון הגלוי; ובהמזמור שקודם תק"ש מדובר בענין רצון המוחלט עצמו, שנמשך רק לישראל… וראה לעיל הערה 12 מסידור האריז"ל, דהפיכת מדה"ד לרחמים היא ע"י **אמירת המזמור**. — The longest note in the maamar, and the reconciliation promised at note 12. Its structure: the shofros verses concern the drawing into the *world* — the absolute will as it bears on the revealed will; the psalm before the tekios concerns the absolute will *itself*, drawn only to Israel. Which is why this psalm in particular emphasises His choice of Israel and, following from it, His mercy on Israel. Then, since the absolute will is drawn by the essence-bittul while the *mitzvah* serves to arouse the revealed will, the note suggests that the psalm's effects may be drawn already by the *preparation* for the tekios, before the mitzvah is performed — because the essence-bittul is revealed in the preparation too. That reconciles the Arizal's siddur, for which the saying of the psalm itself flips judgment to mercy. AS CITED (the Arizal reference is by way of note 12; the rest is the maamar's own reasoning, flagged with אולי יש לומר).

62✳ ולהעיר מלשון המדרש "נוטלין את שופריהן ותוקעין" – דלכאורה הול"ל "שתוקעין", ומה נוגע שנוטלין את שופריהן? וי"ל, שהכוונה ב"נוטלין כו' ותוקעין", שנוטלים השופר בכדי לתקוע, ועי"ז עצמו מהפכים מדה"ד לרחמים. — The asterisked sub-note, and the finest small thing in the apparatus. Why does the midrash say Israel *take up* their shofros and blow, rather than simply that they blow? Because the taking-up-in-order-to-blow is itself what flips the measure of judgment into mercy. The reaching for the horn already carries the bittul; the sound is not the first moment of the act. VERIFIED (a reading of the wording at note 8, which is itself verified)

2. וכל אדם — Let No One Be Present

* AS CITED Publisher's note: issued in Kuntres Vov Tishrei 5751, for the yahrzeit of Rebbetzin Chana (Shabbos Teshuvah, 6 Tishrei 5725/5751 observance). Continuation of the previous maamar, ד"ה יבחר לנו, R"H of the same year.

1 VERIFIED Vayikra 16:17 — the maamar's own opening verse, quoted and translated in section א.

2 AS CITED Yerushalmi Yoma 1:5.

3 AS CITED Yechezkel 1:10.

4 AS CITED Printed in Ohr HaTorah, Drushei Yom Kippur, p. 1155ff.; see there p. 1158.

5 AS CITED Shemos Rabbah 38:8.

6 AS CITED Vayikra 16:3.

7 AS CITED Bereishis Rabbah 49:2.

8 AS CITED Tehillim 25:14.

9 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah p. 1156 (internal reference within the Tzemach Tzedek's own maamar).

10 VERIFIED The maamar's own parenthetical gloss: the healing that comes through teshuvah, as distinct from teshuvah itself (the fifth blessing).

11 AS CITED Yoma 86a.

12 AS CITED Megillah 17b.

13 AS CITED As worded in Ohr HaTorah there; see Megillah there.

14 AS CITED Start of Mesechta Yoma; Rambam, Hilchos Avodas Yom HaKippurim 1:3.

15 AS CITED Yoma 14a (Mishnah); Rambam ibid. 1:5.

16 AS CITED Yoma 53b (Mishnah); Rambam ibid. 3:5.

17 AS CITED Tehillim 27:4.

18 AS CITED Shir HaShirim 6:9; see note 23 below.

19 VERIFIED The maamar's own qualifying note: even higher — as shown by circumcision being the prerequisite whose merit admits entry to the Holy of Holies.

20 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:6, "most fitting and accepted immediately" — with the maamar's own added reasoning about the seven-days/eighth-day structure of the Ten Days themselves, cross-referenced internally.

21 AS CITED Rambam ibid. 2:7.

22 AS CITED Editorial note in the source, comparing the order of the sprinklings to the precedence of water-libation over wine-libation on Sukkos (Likkutei Torah, Sukkos 80b, and elsewhere) — reproduced as printed, not independently traced.

23 AS CITED Cross-reference to the Tzemach Tzedek's own maamar (that "one above" is the level of "one is she, my dove"); Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 40a; Tosafos, Menachos 18a, s.v. עד אחת.

24 VERIFIED Nitzavim 30:11.

25 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, ד"ה כי המצוה, Nitzavim 45b.

26 AS CITED Likkutei Torah there, 45c–d; Ohr HaTorah there, p. 1155–6.

27 AS CITED Pardes Rimonim, Sha'ar 12 ch. 2; Reishis Chochmah, Sha'ar HaTeshuvah ch. 6; Shelah; Shu"t Chacham Tzvi §18; Sha'ar HaYichud VehaEmunah ch. 6 — the gematria of Elokim = hateva (86) is a standard identity across these sources, reproduced as cited, not independently recomputed here.

28 VERIFIED Yisro 20:2.

29 VERIFIED Koheles 7:29.

30 AS CITED Tehillim 11:7; Likkutei Torah, Re'eh 23d ff.

31 VERIFIED Koheles 7:29, same verse as note 29.

32 VERIFIED Hoshea 14:2.

33 AS CITED Yerushalmi Makkos 2:6; Yalkut Shimoni Yechezkel §358; Tehillim §702.

34 AS CITED As worded in Likkutei Torah, Drushei Shabbos Shuvah 67d.

35 AS CITED Yechezkel 18:4, 18:20.

36 AS CITED Version as in Vavei HaAmudim (by the son of the Shelah), ch. 21; also Likkutei Torah there.

37 AS CITED Mishlei 13:21.

38 VERIFIED Tehillim 25:8 — the maamar's own proof-text, translated in full in the body.

39 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Kuntreisim vol. 1, 133b — Chochmah here meaning chochmah tata'ah, Nevuah meaning Netzach-Hod.

40 AS CITED Introduction to Tikkunei Zohar, Pesach Eliyahu.

41 AS CITED Tanya, Iggeres HaKodesh §19.

42 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah, Yom Kippur, p. 1157ff.; Hemshech Ayin-Beis vol. 3, p. 1202.

43 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Korach 53b; Tanya ch. 35, hagahah.

44 VERIFIED The maamar's own parenthetical explanation: the three pillars the world stands on — gemilus chassadim (Chesed), avodah (Gevurah), Torah (Tiferes).

45 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Ayin-Beis, p. 32.

46 AS CITED Menachos 53b.

47 VERIFIED Tehillim 145:9 — cited twice in the same passage, both instances the same verse.

48 AS CITED Tehillim 125:4.

49 AS CITED Sanhedrin 39b.

50 AS CITED Eichah 3:25.

51 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah, Yom Kippur, p. 1157; at length in Sefer HaLikkutim, Tzemach Tzedek, erech Tov, p. 1056ff.

52 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah there, by a different route.

53 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah there; Sefer HaMaamarim Ayin-Tof-Reish, p. 94. Internal note in the source itself: this is not that the recipients are worthy, but only from the "good" that is from Above — cross-referenced to section ו of this maamar.

54 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Ayin-Beis (as in note 45): after establishing that Torah's root is in the Essence, adds that Torah's being called "good" is the matter of "good and upright is Havayah."

55 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Ayin-Tof-Reish, p. 98ff.

56 VERIFIED Cross-reference within this maamar to section ג's own theme (that below should be like above).

57 VERIFIED Cross-reference within this maamar to note 20 above.

58 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 1:3, "the essence of Yom Kippur atones for those who return" — the source's own inference: this shows that "the day's essence atones" applies even on the view that Yom Kippur atones only the penitent (Shevuos 13a).

59 AS CITED Cross-referenced by the source itself to ד"ה שובה ישראל (the second, 5737), Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei p. 98ff., section ד.

60 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar in this series, ד"ה יבחר לנו, sections ה and ט — confirmed against that edition's own text in this series.

61 AS CITED Cross-referenced by the source to 5727 ד"ה השקיפה ממעון קדשך, end of section ט, Sefer HaMaamarim Elul p. 253.

62 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:7 — the source's own gloss: in addition to the general mitzvah of teshuvah year-round, Yom Kippur's teshuvah is (a further mitzvah and) an obligation.

63 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar, ד"ה יבחר לנו, section ט — confirmed against that edition's own text in this series (see note 60).

64 VERIFIED Cross-reference within this maamar to note 23 above.

65 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 42a; Ohr HaTorah (Yahel Ohr) on Tehillim, p. 102.

66 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Tishrei, p. 218ff.; Sefer HaMaamarim Av, p. 172ff.

67 AS CITED Torah Or, Lech Lecha 13b; Ohr HaTorah, Yom Kippur, p. 1155–6.

68 VERIFIED Nitzavim 30:12.

69 AS CITED Tikkunei Zohar, Tikkun 22 (65b, 66a); Tikkun 70 (131a).

70 AS CITED Sha'ar HaYichud VehaEmunah, start of ch. 4; Zohar III 257b (in Ra'aya Mehemna); Pardes Rimonim, Sha'ar 1, ch. 9.

71 AS CITED Cross-referenced by the source to the two names Havayah: the first, "it arose in His will to bring the worlds into being" — Sefer HaMaamarim 5656, p. 365ff.

72 AS CITED Zohar III 32a.

73 AS CITED Cross-referenced by the source to the sichah of Simchas Beis HaShoeivah of this same year (5723), printed in Likkutei Sichos vol. 4, p. 1154.

74 AS CITED Zohar I 208b; cited in Ohr HaTorah, Yom Kippur, p. 1159; and at the start and end of ד"ה ביום השמיני עצרת across several years' editions per the source's own cross-reference.

75 VERIFIED Vayigash 45:1 — the maamar's own proof-text, translated in the body.

76 AS CITED Pinchas 29:35.

77 AS CITED Vayeitzei 30:24.

78 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah, Vayeitzei vol. 6, p. 823a.

79 AS CITED Mishlei 5:17; Shemos Rabbah 15:23 — cross-referenced by the source across several years' editions of ד"ה ביום השמע"צ.

3. בסוכות תשבו — In Sukkos Shall You Dwell

1 VERIFIED Vayikra (Emor) 23:42–43 — the maamar's own opening verse, translated in full in section א.

2 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 43ff.; see there p. 44.

3 AS CITED At the start of the maamar of 5703 (p. 44) only the first point is explicit; the second is drawn out from the maamar's own closing explanation (p. 52, transcribed above in the body).

4 AS CITED Sukkah 11b (per one view) that the sukkos were clouds of glory; so Rashi ad loc.; so halachically, Shulchan Aruch Admor HaZakein, Hilchos Sukkah, start of §625 — from which it follows that "I made dwell" refers to the Creator's own act alone.

5 AS CITED Closing of the 5703 maamar (Sefer HaMaamarim there, p. 52).

6 AS CITED Cross-referenced below to section ג.

7 AS CITED I Shmuel 15:29.

8 VERIFIED Same verse as note 7, cited a second time for the body's second quotation of it.

9 AS CITED Referenced teaching on "our festive day" — concealed matters of Rosh Hashanah/Yom Kippur revealed on Sukkos; see Likkutei Torah, Drushim for Rosh Hashanah 54b ff.

10 AS CITED As cited in the scan; internal forward cross-reference within this maamar.

11 AS CITED Hemshech Basi LeGani 5710, ch. 18ff. (Sefer HaMaamarim 5710, p. 153ff.); 5728 ד"ה באתי לגני (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 243ff.; there p. 257).

12 VERIFIED I Shmuel 15:29 — the maamar's own citation, matching notes 7/8.

13 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Drushim for Rosh Hashanah 54c ff.; cross-referenced in this maamar of 5739 (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 4, p. 28, note 54).

14 VERIFIED Tehillim 81:4 — cited in the body at the "shofar" cross-reference.

15 AS CITED The known teaching that sukkah covering was made from the clouds of the Yom Kippur incense — Peiras Sha'ar Yom Kippur ch. 12 (28a); cross-referenced in this maamar of 5741 note 5 (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 121).

16 AS CITED At length in 5729 ד"ה באתי לגני, section ט (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 3, p. 47ff. per the scan's own locator).

17 AS CITED Semag, positive commandment 16; Ran on Rosh Hashanah 16b — cited in the Chiddushei Aggados of the Maharsha to Rosh Hashanah ad loc.

18 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:4.

19 AS CITED Cross-referenced below; also Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 137.

20 AS CITED Rashi's language on Shemos 3:3; see Sefer HaSichos 5702, p. 47 (transcribed in Sefer HaMaamarim there, p. 136, note 43) that this is the matter of the teshuvah of tzaddikim.

21 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 1, p. 366ff.; cross-referenced also to ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' of this year, section ח (above, p. 21), and its note 67.

22 AS CITED Bereishis Rabbah ch. 8:7; Rus Rabbah ch. 2:1 (3).

23 AS CITED The scan's own qualifying note: but from the side of the soul's root in the matter of "with whom did He take counsel," this kind of change would not be possible, as below in section ה.

24 AS CITED The scan's own note: that the change wrought in a person through teshuvah is not only in the internal faculties but also in the matter of accepting the yoke [of Heaven], which is from the essence of the soul above the revealed faculties — on this basis it is understood that through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur a change is wrought (on Sukkos) in the encompassing lights, that they become settled lights.

25 AS CITED Tanya, end of ch. 24.

26 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar, ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי', section ז — confirmed against that edition's own text in this series.

27 AS CITED Added to the explanation from the maamar ד"ה וכל אדם, ibid.

28 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 1:3; see ד"ה הנ"ל, note 58.

29 VERIFIED Rosh Hashanah 16a; ibid. 34b. And see at length ד"ה יבחר לנו of this year (5723), section ז (above, p. 7).

30 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamar, ד"ה יבחר לנו — its own three-tier map of the shofar, confirmed against that edition's text in this series.

31 AS CITED Pri Eitz Chaim, Sha'ar 24 (Sha'ar Rosh Hashanah); see also Sefer HaMaamarim 5723 (this year), as cited below note 35.

32 AS CITED The scan's own note on the matter of "mitzvah" within the Ten Days — that vigilance in mitzvos is greater in the Ten Days than the rest of the year (Shulchan Aruch Admor HaZakein, Orach Chaim, Hilchos Rosh Hashanah, start of §603).

33 AS CITED Tehillim 130:1; see the cross-reference in Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 2, p. 115, note 2.

34 AS CITED Zohar III 70a.

35 AS CITED 5703 ד"ה שיר המעלות (Sefer HaMaamarim 5703, p. 25ff.).

36 AS CITED Zohar II 63a ff.

37 AS CITED Tehillim 119:10.

38 AS CITED Sefer HaMaamarim 5668, p. 16.

39 AS CITED That in addition to the drawing of "the essence of the day" through the teshuvah of Yom Kippur, teshuvah itself is also loftier — see the maamar ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי', section ב.

40 AS CITED The scan's own qualifying note (see above section ה): that the significance of Yom Kippur's teshuvah (not only the cause of teshuvah, but teshuvah itself) is to reveal the essential bond.

41 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 2:7.

42 AS CITED Rambam, ibid. 7:4.

43 AS CITED Sukkah 27b; see 5738 ד"ה זה (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 1, p. 250ff.).

4. תורה צוה לנו משה — Torah Commanded to Us by Moshe

1 VERIFIED Devarim (Berachah) 33:4 — the maamar's own opening verse, translated in full in section א.

2 AS CITED Sanhedrin 59a; see also there 91b.

3 AS CITED The scan's own qualifying note: and not only to the general community (in the manner of the theft of a tribe's own portion).

4 VERIFIED Devarim 33:5 — the verse immediately following, translated in section א.

5 AS CITED Ohr HaTorah, Berachah (s.p. 1848; there p. 1846); the maamar of 5654 (Sefer HaMaamarim 5654, p. 39).

6 AS CITED Pirkei Avos 2:10.

7 AS CITED Pirkei d'Rabbi Eliezer ch. 41; Shemos Rabbah 28:6; Tanchuma Yisro 11; Zohar I 91a; and elsewhere.

8 AS CITED Devarim (Berachah) 33:5.

9 AS CITED Cross-referenced above to note 4.

10 AS CITED See Likkutei Torah, Ha'azinu 75d ff.

11 AS CITED Pesachim 50b; and elsewhere.

12 AS CITED Pesachim 68b.

13 AS CITED Toldos 27:1, 15, 42.

14 VERIFIED Malachi 1:2.

15 VERIFIED Ha'azinu 32:2 — the maamar's own proof-text, translated in full in section ג.

16 VERIFIED Bereishis 2:6.

17 AS CITED The scan's own note: in most places it states that the descent of rain is through refining the level below by raising it up; see Hemshech 5677 for this understanding of rain; see also ד"ה Shir HaMa'alos LeDavid Hinei Mah Tov (5723, p. 3ff., and the notes there).

18 AS CITED Bereishis Rabbah 13:4.

19 AS CITED Tanna d'Vei Eliyahu ch. 18; Yalkut Shimoni, Eichah, remez 1004.

20 AS CITED As in Likkutei Torah there (76a); but in most of the discourses cited in note 8, "the Holy One reads and reviews opposite him" refers instead to the rain of Torah. See below, section ד.

21 AS CITED See also Hemshech 5706, p. 307: that the matter of Torah's inheritance (which is from the side of Torah's refinements) is in the revealed dimension of Torah, and the dew of Torah is the internal dimension of Torah — though there it says that the dew of Torah (the internal dimension) is itself the matter of the gift of Torah.

22 AS CITED Yoma 72b.

23 AS CITED Following what is cited below in section ה: that the revelation within concealment, through the rectification of the concealment of Havayah, is not like the revelation of Havayah Itself.

24 AS CITED See also Berachos 5a: "three gifts… Torah…"

25 AS CITED In the wording of the prayer and kiddush of the festival.

26 AS CITED On what follows, see at length the discourses cited in note 8; and see also ד"ה Shloshah Devarim Ha'olam Omeid Al… 5714, section ה (Sefer HaMaamarim Melukat vol. 4, p. 386).

27 VERIFIED Eikev 11:13–14.

28 VERIFIED Continuing in the verse (there, 15–16): "and you turn aside and serve [other gods]… [and then] there will be no rain."

29 AS CITED Taanis 3a.

30 AS CITED Avodah Zarah 3b.

31 AS CITED Hemshech Tereb (5672) vol. 1, ch. 181 (p. 380).

32 AS CITED The scan's own note: like the comprehension of souls in Gan Eden in their own engagement with Torah, which is comprehension in the fullest sense; and so too Torah as it is in Atzilus, which speaks of matters of G-dliness, is comprehension in the fullest sense (Hemshech Tereb there).

33 AS CITED Cross-referenced also to Hemshech 5667, cited in note 21.

34 AS CITED As in Likkutei Torah cited in note 36, and elsewhere; and see Yeshayahu 44:1, "and now, hear, Yaakov My servant" — cited above as "hear, Yaakov My servant."

35 VERIFIED Shemos 4:22.

36 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Balak 70c; Hemshech 5669, p. 225.

37 AS CITED On what follows, see Hemshech 5669 there, and there s.p. 226ff.

38 VERIFIED Vayishlach 32:29.

39 AS CITED Zohar I 174a.

40 AS CITED Eitz Chaim, Sha'ar 3 (Sha'ar Seder Atzilus LeMaharachu) ch. 2; Pardes, Sha'ar 23 (Sha'ar Erchei HaKinuyim), s.v. entry.

41 AS CITED Balak 72a–b.

42 VERIFIED Bereishis 2:2.

43 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 1:3; see also Ohr HaTorah, [various citations] p. 1461ff.

44 AS CITED Nitzavim, ibid.; and see Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 1:3.

45 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, Shir HaShirim 1:3; and elsewhere; see also Hemshech 5669, p. 226ff.

46 AS CITED Shabbos 119a.

47 AS CITED Shabbos 63a.

48 AS CITED The scan's own note: and this is also proven from the teaching that a gentile who studies Torah is liable for death (Sanhedrin 59a), and that one who withholds a legal ruling from a student is as though he robbed him of his ancestral inheritance (there, 91b).

49 AS CITED See Likkutei Sichos vol. 13, p. 115.

50 AS CITED See in various places in the works of the Rogatchover (Responsa Tzafnas Panei'ach, Dvinsk vol. 1 §18; Warsaw vol. 2 §18; Tzafnas Panei'ach Miluim 13a).

51 AS CITED The scan's own note: and on the face of it, the source for Yaakov being called by the name of the Essence requires further study.

52 VERIFIED Tehillim 47:5 — the opening verse of the Rosh Hashanah sibling maamar in this series.

53 AS CITED Hemshech Rosh Hashanah 5703, p. 24.

54 VERIFIED Cross-reference to the sibling maamarim, ד"ה יבחר לנו section ה (above, p. 7) and ד"ה וכל אדם לא יהי' section 17 (above, p. 20–21) — confirmed against those editions' own text in this series.

55 VERIFIED Cross-reference to "that you make Me King over you" from the Rosh Hashanah sibling, section ט — confirmed against that edition's own text in this series.

56 AS CITED Likkutei Torah, start of Nitzavim.

57 AS CITED Rambam, Hilchos Teshuvah 9:2.

58 VERIFIED Yeshayahu 11:9 — the maamar's own closing proof-text, translated in the body.

COLOPHON

This volume

Assembled from the four standalone Parkland editions in the Tishrei 5723 set, each built, verified, and shipped independently before this volume was begun — per the build rules governing this series, no work on a combined volume was started, scaffolded, or prepared for while any of the four individual editions remained unshipped. Body text, deep dives, and footnote content are reproduced from those four editions unchanged; only the front matter, connections map, and source-note grouping are new to this volume.

OpenChassidus · Parkland Edition · תשרי ה'תשכ"ג